Catholic Hlind

VOL. XLVIII

MAY, 1950

NO. 1049

Exploration Beneath St. Peter's

FRANCIS X. MURPHY

Reprinted from THOUGHT*

S EARLY as August 1941, Father A Anthony Ferrua, S.J., in two articles in Civilta Cattolica,1 gave notice of a series of excavations that had been initiated in the grotto beneath St. Peter's by a singular accident of fate. Searching for a fitting resting place for the tomb of Pius XI, Monsignor Ludovico Kaas, Secretary for the Fabric of St. Peter's, had come across a number of walledover alcoves beneath the western sector of the present transept in the Vatican Basilica which, when entered, revealed several ancient tombs. In a further attempt to prepare a fitting foundation for the magnificent, monolithic sarcophagus supplied for the remains of Pius XI by the metropolitan Chapter of Milan, the marble top of an ancient Roman mausoleum was unearthed. Further investigation proved this to be but one of a double row of such monuments running from beneath the main altar of St. Peter's out to the obelisk in the center of the Piazza.

The full significance of these discoveries was announced to the world in a radio discourse by Pius XII on May 13, 1942. Revealing the fact that the excavations had unearthed the foundation lines of the previous basilica constructed by Constantine in the late 320's, the Pontiff went on to say:

¹ "Nelle Grotte de S. Pietro," Civ. Catt. (1941) vol. III, 358-365; 424-433; "Nnove scaperte sotto S. Pietro," ibid. (1942) vol. IV, 73-86; 228-241.

^{*} Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y., December, 1949.

Then in the central section, where have been erected, one above the other, three altars of diverse ages, the insatiable zeal of the excavators has uncovered a monument, simple in form, but to which, long before the age of Constantine, the devotion of the faithful had given the character of a venerable place of worship. This is testified by graffiti which are to be seen on a wall within the monument, and which display the same character as those to be met with in the tombs of the martyrs in the Christian catacombs. These graffiti, carrying us back to the times of the persecutions, give us historical certitude that we here possess the remains of that monument (tropaeum) of which the priest Gaius spoke about the year 200 A.D. His jubilant declaration has been preserved for us by Eusebius: "I indeed can show you the monuments of the Apostles. . . . "2

The Pontiff's "monument, simple in form" was a direct reference to the "semicircular Confession of St. Peter," which in almost its present form goes back to the times of St. Gregory the Great (604), and in which was discovered the tomb of St. Peter. This rather startling fact was confirmed by another statement of the Pope, made to a group of Roman students on the last Sunday of January, 1949: "Here in the circus of Nero, concerning which fact we possess incontestable archeological evidence, [Peter] died as a confessor

of Christ. Under the central point of the gigantic cupola [of St. Peter's] was and is the place of his burial. . . ."

CENTER OF CHRISTENDOM

The present Pontiff's two announcements have thus summed up almost ten years of continuous exploration beneath a spot that has been revered as the center of Christendom for close to 1,900 years. Legend as well as early Christian historical testimony maintained that St. Peter had been put to death in the Circus of Nero, and buried immediately thereafter on the Vatican hill. Renaissance scholarship had decided that in building his great basilica to the Prince of Apostles, the Emperor Constantine had used the foundation walls of the Neronian circus as part of the new edifice's supports. But no attempt was made to verify this hypothesis in the course of the hundred-year construction of Michelangelo's and Bramante's present Basilica.

Latest excavations have revealed no trace whatever of the Circus of Nero, though they have gone down to "virgin soil" beneath the remains of Constantine's Church. Instead they have turned up two long rows of

² The three altars referred to by the Pope are the present main altar in St. Peter's erected by Clement VIII in 1594, that of Callistus II (1119-1124) and what was probably the original altar constructed for Pope Silvester I (314-336) in keeping with the commission of Constantine. Cf. E. Kirschbaum, S.J., L. Hertling, S.J., Le Catacombe Romane e i Loro Martiri Rome (1949), 106-107.

t

0

funeral monuments that originally ran from the top of the Vatican hill down along the south-western slope. Constantine had simply selected one of these mausoleums as the pivot of his new edifice, lopping off the top of the hill to form a level and foundation for his church, thus filling in and destroying the rest of the Roman Besides violating immecemetery. morial law and custom regarding the inviolability of Roman cemeteries, he put his engineers to a tremendous task, complicated by the presence of innumerable springs and streams which had to be detoured and relocated.

There could be only one compelling reason for his selection of such a site. Constantine chose the monumentum splendidissimum, which certain Christian tradition assured him contained the body of St. Peter, as the nucleus of his Basilica. Modern archeological excavations within that monument, with their discovery of graffiti invocations to the saint, and some 1,500 coins, both ancient and medieval, deposited round the tomb by pious worshippers and pilgrims, have confirmed both his choice and the tradition.

As for the circus of Nero in which Peter was martyred—it was definitely

close by, probably to the left of the present edifice, when facing the rear. For on a monument located on the extreme eastern end of the *iter* or path between the two groups of mausoleums, a codicil to the will of one Heraclea Popilius was found, in which that Roman sportsman directed his own interment to be made *in vaticano ad circum*—on the Vatican hill, near the Circus.

SUPERVISED BY THE POPE

Under the direct supervision of the Pope himself and Monsignor Kaas, the excavations under St. Peter's have been carried out by a group of famous archeologists and engineers including Ferrua, S.J., Engilbert Fathers Kirschbaum, S.J., and Professors Enrico Josi, Giuseppe Nicolosi and Dr. Bruno Ghetti, all connected with Rome's several universities and the Pontifical Institute of Christian Archeology. The sanpietrini, as the Vatican workmen are called, did most of the actual digging, though occasionally they were superseded by the professorial members of the staff themselves, when a particularly delicate bit of excavational work found them digging out treasures with their own bare hands.

The whole project had been

19

di

he

ez

Ca

th

18

n

c t t

shrouded in the strictest secrecy from the very beginning, with only occasional reports being released to learned archeological journals. There were several well-founded reasons for this secrecy. The excavationary project proved a most complicated operation from the start, many of the main supports of St. Peter's having been in need of undermining and reinforcement. The importance of possible discoveries from a devotional and tradition stand-point likewise dictated great prudence in the handling of press and news releases. But above all, the Pontiff and the commission were determined to have the work proceed in accordance with strict, well-integrated scientific principles and practices.

Because of the vast character of the operation, and its historical importance, it was decided to proceed with the main unearthing operations, cataloguing and photographing each find in its original location; and to leave the opening of individual tombs discovered intact, and the main work of identification, to an international commission of archeologists and historians to be invited by the Holy Father himself to participate in this monumental task.

Over sixteen large mausoleums have thus far been uncovered, revealing continuous use between the first and the fourth centuries after Christ. Containing tombs, inscriptions and monuments of both pagans

and Christians side by side, they will form a whole new chapter in our knowledge of the social and religious practices of ancient and early Christian Rome. Exquisitely sculptured figures, bas-reliefs and mosaics abound, the decorations in several of the monuments attesting their use by succeeding generations. A first-century Egyptian motif prevails in one mausoleum; another monument, immediately bordering on the Confession, gives evidence of having on its walls the most ancient Christian mosaics now known. One of the marble coffins has a cover decorated with finely sculptured figures depicting on one side, the sale of Joseph to the Ismaelites and on the other, the Adoration of the Magi. It dates from the middle of the fourth century and is unique in as far as the artist has placed a cross immediately behind the throne on which the Blessed Virgin is seated with the infant in her arms receiving the homage of the Magi.

TOMB OF ST. PETER

The focal point of the excavations is, of course, the tomb of St. Peter. Here still the greatest secrecy prevails. It is known that a book has gone through the Vatican press describing the findings in full; but the actual revelation awaits the announcement of Pius XII himself. Despite rumors and an occasional sensational news story, better opinion round the

11

de

i- ie i- ie h

n e o n d s d r-r

Vatican indicates that "more has been discovered than the archeologists had hoped for; but less than the faithful expect." This would seem to indicate that the bones or dust of St. Peter have not been found—nor was their discovery even looked for. It is even quite probable that the tomb of Peter itself has not been opened, the Pope and his archeologists having prudently decided to await the formation of their international commission.

These discoveries are not of crucial value in any theological sense, of course. They merely add further confirmation to a fact now conceded by all objectively minded historians, that Peter lived and died in Rome. The present Pope, Pius XII, has put them in their proper perspective. In his talk to the students of Rome, he concluded:

If ever there should come a day (and I speak now in pure hypothesis) when

the material Rome should crumble; if ever this very basilica, the symbol of the one, invincible, and victorious Catholic Church, should bury beneath its own ruins its historic treasures, the sacred tombs which it shelters, even then the Church will not be curtailed or destroyed. The promise of Christ made to Peter shall ever remain true. The Papacy will ever endure. . . In this, Eternal Rome, taken in a supernatural sense, is superior to the Rome of history. Its very nature and its truth are independent of the latter.

It is still comforting to have firsthand evidence for the truth of the statements of the fourth-century Church historian, Eusebius of Caesarea, concerning "the monuments designated with the names of Peter and Paul that are even now (circa 320) to be seen in the cemeteries of Rome." It is also satisfying to have the discovery of a rock beneath the Basilica of St. Peter lead to such testimony concerning the martyrdom and burial of "the Rock" that was Peter.

Fraternities and Fraternity

"New England schools have always been leaders in the scholastic field. Last spring Yale took a great step forward in interracial justice when Levi Jackson, Negro football captain, was admitted to one of Yale's finest fraternities. It is to be hoped that other schools will follow and that the movement will come from within the societies themselves and not as the result of campuswide bans by college officials. The collegiate youth of today are the leaders of the very near future and it is necessary that they continue to show a spirit of fair play and practice genuine democracy today in preparation for tomorrow."—The Interracial Review, January, 1950.

Debate With Blanshard

ROBERT C. HARTNETT, S.J. Editor-in-Chief of AMERICA

APPRECIATE your courtesy in inviting me here tonight. I can understand your wanting to hear the author of a somewhat sensational book, and I think it was fair of your Committee to invite me to reply to his attack on the Catholic Church as an alleged "menace" to American freedom.

It is not a particularly pleasant assignment, of course. I feel very much like our U. S. representatives to the UN when they are called upon to reply to one of Mr. Vishinsky's periodic and somewhat routine blasts at the U. S. as an "imperialistic, capitalistic, war-mongering democracy"— in contrast to the lovely "people's democracies" they have behind the Iron Curtain.

The trouble in both cases is that the entire systems of thought of the parties to the debate are basically irreconcilable. The aggressor always has the advantage in such debates, but I hope to show that the reason why our systems of thought are so irreconcilable is that, like Mr. Vishinsky, my opponent makes sweeping and entirely arbitrary assumptions that are not true and then proceeds to ridicule the Catholic Church for not measuring up to the false stand-

Address before the Forum of the Yale Law School Student Association, Yale Law School, February 21, 1950. In delivering this talk, Father Hartnett departed somewhat from the text.

ards he has set. Some of his asumptions are about the Catholic Church—that the Hierarchy is chiefly engaged in a drive for political power, for example. Even more of his assumptions are about what he seems to think democracy means—he seems to mean the overriding of minorities by majorities, even in the purely religious sphere. Other arbitrary assumptions concern what he seems to think morality means—for him morality means whatever short-run human convenience suggests.

I. LEGAL POSITIVISM

For him, State laws are beyond criticism by the human conscience. I'd like to quote right here what President Truman said last Wednesday (February 15) of that kind of spineless morality. Speaking to a meeting of law enforcement officers in Washington, he declared:

The fundamental basis of this nation's law was given to Moses on the

Mount. The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings which we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul.

If we don't have the proper moral background, we will finally wind up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the State.

When a man tells you that the Catholic Church is a "menace" to American freedom because it teaches a moral code about marriage, sterilization, abortion and the rest that is in conflict with the conduct which American law allows, he is saying that we get our code of moral conduct from man-made laws. Many of you may possibly believe this, but I came to tell you that I think, with President Truman, that such a system of crude legal positivism leads directly to totalitarianism.

There are plenty of countries behind the Iron Curtain where the State does steamroller all criticism based on the kind of moral code the Catholic Church has preserved for 2,000 years. I never thought I'd live to hear an American citizen idealize such tyranny. Yet that is precisely what my opponent's charges amount to: we refuse to conform our moral ideals to what man-made law allows. Our American system of law does not yet impose what it allows as a system of morality.

Anybody who knows the first thing about the history of western political thought knows that Catholics and other Christians, on the basis of the Christian law of justice, resisted tyrants and thus won for us the greatest political achievement of modern times—the prize of constitutional limitations on the arbitrary power of government. It doesn't make any difference whether the rulers are kings, dictators, a ruling party or what Alexis de Tocqueville in his classic Democracy in America called "the tyranny of the majority."

When the day comes that a majority of Americans adopt the political theory of my opponent, on that day freedom will have vanished from our shores. Every minority will be at the mercy of every majority. We can see what this is like in our own South today. I'd like to ask my opponent whether he thinks the beliefs of the Negroes of Georgia are a "menace" to the freedom of Georgians, just because they run counter to the beliefs of the white majority, which has subjugated them for generations.

II. LACK OF FIRST-HAND INFORMATION

The main handicap under which my opponent operates, outside of his horrible misconception of what American freedom means, is his lack of first-hand knowledge of Catholicism—as a doctrine and as an institution. Reviewers have praised his book for its "documentation." Why does he document it so much? Because all he knows about the Catholic Church

19

lo

gl

al

0

H

tl

is

ti

te

PS

t

I

is drawn from printed sources. He's like a foreigner who had never visited the United States but wrote a book about it from our Constitution, our newspaper stories, pamphlets he laid his hands on. You don't have to have much imagination to see that it could all be documented—and yet present a grotesque caricature of the way we live. The documentation, instead of being a boast, would be a confession of lack of first-hand knowledge.

On the other hand, I have read a great deal more than my opponent about Catholicism. Beyond that, I have lived inside the Catholic Church for forty-five years. I have spent twenty-seven years in the Catholic school system he seems to have discovered lately; from kindergarten through graduate school, including seven years of teaching at the University of Detroit, Xavier University in Cincinnati and Fordham University. I've spent nine years in Jesuit seminaries, here and abroad, studying Catholic doctrine. I'd surely have to be a mental defective not to know a great deal more than my opponent about both Catholic doctrine and Catholic institutional practices.

He has no way whatsoever to evaluate his sources. He cites as typical, Catholic authors who are known by all Catholic students to be more rigorous than others. Time and again he cites speakers and guides—many of them ten, fifteen and twenty years

ago, by the way-whose advice and estimates of situations have no more authority than the next man's. He even cites popular pamphlets at times. And, of course, he cites an author like William Teeling who has no standing in Catholic circles at all. You'd think that Hilaire Belloc was a great theologian to hear my opponent tell it. This is all confusion worse confounded. It's like trying to describe a beautiful stained-glass window in a cathedral by looking at it from the outside, when those inside (for whom it was made) alone can see the image clearly, with the sun streaming through. I'll give you examples as I go along.

III. INARTICULATE MAJOR PREMISES

My opponent contends that he is not attacking the "personal" religious beliefs of Catholics; what he considers a "menace" to American freedom is the attempt of the Catholic Hierarchy to "control the judgment of its own people on foreign affairs, social hygiene, public education and modern science" (American Freedom and Catholic Power, p. 3).

This is clever dodge to cover up his attack on the personal beliefs of Catholics:

1. It happens to be the "personal faith" of every Catholic that Almighty God, through Jesus Christ, empowered the Hierarchy to apply moral judgments to all areas of he-

ay nd

re

He

an

as Ill.

as

p-

OB

ng 186

at in-

ne

he

on

is

d.

m

er.

its

ial

m

nd

up

of

al

M-

dy

.

man conduct, social as well as private.

He never argues the profound theological question of whether God did grant the Catholic Hierarchy this authority. He assumes God did not. Of course if God didn't, the Catholic Hierarchy has arrogated to itself authority not belonging to it. But this is a theological, not a political question. No political system has a right to decide such a theological issue. Instead of adhering to the "American principle of separation of Church and State," my opponent is invoking American democracy—a political system—to decide a theological issue.

All I wish to do here is to quote a Protestant reviewer of two eminently scholarly volumes by a pair of French Catholic historians—Jules Lebreton and Jacques Zeiller. Their work is called *The History of the Primitive Church*, very recently published by Macmillan (585 and 687 pp.). In the N. Y. *Times Book Review* for Jan. 29, 1950, Dr. Edward R. Hardy, Jr., Professor of Church History at Berkeley Divinity School, called this two-volume work "French scholarship at its best." He went on:

Lebreton and Zeiller write as Roman Catholic scholars, but with complete honesty in presenting both their own convictions and the evidence which others read differently . . . those to whom the position of the Papacy and the Episcopacy seem less clear and the formulation of the orthodox creed less inevitable are not ignored. (p. 25). Notice the cautious language: "the

evidence which others read differently," and "those to whom the position of the Papacy and the Episcopacy seems less clear and the formulation of the orthodox creed less inevitable. . . ."

Mr. Blanshard in his book dismisses in less than one page the issues presented in these two lengthy and carefully documented volumes (p. 21). He assures his reader, with the sublime confidence of an amateur. "According to the greatest authorities Christian history, the early Christian knew nothing about the primacy of Roman bishops." Well, Lebreton and Zeiller are among "the greatest authorities on Christian history" and they are convinced of the exact opposite of what Mr. Blanshard blandly assures us to be true.

This is like writing off the Einstein theory of relativity in one page—by an author with no authority whatsoever in the field of mathematics, and (let us say) an anti-Semite to boot. It's worthless. Yet his whole case is built on the assumption that he is 100 per cent right and Catholic scholars are 100 per cent wrong on this question.

The New York Board of Superintendents of Education, by the way, decided that Mr. Blanshard's articles in the *Nation* were an attack on the personal religious faith of Catholics. Actually, my opponent's charges make nit-wits and menaces out of all Catholic laymen.

19

A

aı

to

ir

CI

h

C

- 2. Let's take up this central issue of the attempt of the Catholic Hierarchy to "control the judgment of its own people on foreign affairs, social hygiene, public education and modern science." This is supposed to be the center of conflict between the so-called "authoritarian" Catholic Church and American freedom.
- a) As far as attempting to control is concerned, nobody has any right to assume that the Catholic Hierarchy do not enjoy their authority by divine Regardless of institution. Catholics reach their judgments about the application of moral principles to public questions, the real issue is whether an organized religious body has or has not a right to take a stand on the moral and religious issues involved in public questions. How a religious body is organized is nobody's business but that of the members of the organization. That's exactly what religious liberty means. This is really the central fallacy of my opponent's charges, just because Catholics enjoy a unity conspicuously lacking in other denominations, he invokes a political ideology to disrupt this religious unity.

ARE PROTESTANT CHURCHES RUN BY THE PEOPLE?

Of course, the assumption that all Protestant churches are run by the people is a joke. When Bishop Wolfe fired Mr. Melish for his Communistic associations he said he was acting under Protestant Episcopalian Church Law. Whom did the General Board of Methodist Bishops ask when they took their stand against bus rides for Catholic children?

b) In the first place, every religion worthy of the name applies the Ten Commandments and the moral law of justice to "social and political affairs." The Federal Council of Churches has made a very good statement against racial discrimination. It has even issued a bulletin on the Taft-Hartley Act. These are "social and political issues."

The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. on January 27 appointed a special commission to clarify its rules on marriage and divorce. At present Presbyterians may only remarry the "innocent party" and only one year after a divorce has been granted on consider "Scriptural they grounds." Isn't it clear that the Presbyterian Church has its own code of marriage legislation? Is it "un-American" and a "menace" to American freedom because it doesn't let the State legislatures tell it what are "Scriptural grounds," how soon after a divorce the party may re-marry, and whether the guilty as well as the 1 r "innocent" party may re-marry?

Of what use is religion anyway if its morals merely reflect the lowest common denominator written into our divorce laws? Isn't it just as necessary for citizens and lawmakers to learn morality from moralists as

ırch

pard

they

for

reli-

the

oral

tical

of

tate-

ion.

the

ocial

the

d a

ules

sent

the

year

on

ural

the

code

"un-

mer-

t let

are

after

arry,

the "

ly if

west

into

t as

kers

s as

it is for them to learn about atomic warfare from atomic and military scientists? Is Presbyterianism "un-American" because it doesn't teach one thing about divorce in New York and another in Nevada? Isn't it up to the individual, in American democracy, to decide whether he believes in the truth of the Presbyterian moral code and abides by it, or disbelieves in it, breaks its marriage code and hence has to leave the Presbyterian Church? It's exactly the same with Catholicism.

The Congregationalist Church has a Commission on Social Action. This deals with public education, separation of Church and State, etc., from the point of view of Congregationalist doctrine. If a person doesn't believe in Congregationalist doctrine, he can get out of that church. But it has a doctrine of its own, which it applies to "social and political issues."

The International Council of Religious Education, made up of forty Protestant denominations, is just as critical of the lack of religious instruction in the public schools as Catholics are.

Haven't the Protestant Churches raised a howl about the Taylor mission? Isn't that "interfering in politics"?

Moreover, American Protestant denominations participate in the World Council at Amsterdam. That Council took a stand on the relations of Christianity and Communism. Isn't this a "social and political issue"?

c) Of course, my opponent keeps harping on the fact that the Catholic Hierarchy decides on these applications of Catholic morality, whereas the "American democratic system" demands that the people decide them. I've tried to show that a person ought to be free to believe in this country that God gave the Catholic Hierarchy that authority.

Are the Presbyterians going to poll their membership on their marriage and divorce laws? Do Episcopalians? My opponent is trying to foist a semi-Protestant, semi-secularist ideology on America as if all Protestants were of that mentality, and all Catholics and Jews ought to be.

IV. "THE POWER OF THE HIERARCHY"

Let's look a little further into this bugaboo of the "power of the Catholic Hierarchy" to control the judgment of its people in social and political affairs:

1. My opponent has a grotesque idea of what Catholic faith means. You'd think a Bishop was looking over your shoulder every time a Catholic thought of a social or political or medical or educational problem from a moral point of view.

This is ridiculous. If every Bishop in the U. S. died tonight, our moral principles as applied to social ques-

cij

Do

gī

ge

to

lie

ti

g

tions would remain the same. I don't have to ask a Bishop what to think of artificial contraception, or divorce, or education without religion, much less of the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. Actually, except maybe for the internationalization of Jerusalem, there isn't any "Catholic foreign policy." There isn't much of a domestic policy either.

2. Of course, the old standby is the Massachusetts referendum on birth-control. That's supposed to ring the bell every time. Let's take a look at the vote. My opponent in his book says that Massachusetts is two-fifths Catholic (p. 144). Later he records the results of the 1942 referendum in which the people voted seven to five against repeal of a law which Protestants wrote into the statute books in the first place.

Now what sense does it make to charge that Catholics in Massachusetts "imposed" their doctrine on the people when only forty per cent of the people are Catholic and nearly sixty per cent of the vote went against repeal? In 1948 the majority was something like 370,000 against repeal. Tens and hundreds of thousands of non-Catholics must have voted against repeal.

Besides, Mr. Blanshard in his book contends that from fifty to eighty per cent of Catholic women polled are in favor of birth-control, and in favor of disseminating information about it. Now only one of two conclusions

can be drawn: either, despite their personal opinions, Catholics accept the authority of the Church—which is their business; or the Catholic influence in defeating repeal in Massachusetts must have been even smaller than the Catholic population would suggest. The problem of straightening out this dilemma I leave to the author in whose book it appears.

To my mind, if American citizens want to organize against legislation, American freedom demands that they be allowed to do so—whether they do it in churches or otherwise, and no matter where they get their moral concepts—so long as they avoid advocating the use of violence. I think any attempt to restrict this freedom is itself a "menace" to American democracy far more alarming than anything my opponent points out in the Catholic Church.

By the way, didn't Protestants mass their support behind the 18th Amendment? Ever hear of Bishop Cannon? Didn't they plump for our 1924 immigration quotas? Haven't they written into State laws prohibitions against the use of alcohol and even tobacco? For the life of me, I can't see anything un-American about the application of religious beliefs and religious organization to legislation, where religious groups feel that religious issues are involved.

Everybody else organizes for political action. Is the Catholic Church alone supposed to be stripped of its lay

eir

ept

ich

in-

ssa-

Her

uld

en-

the

ens

ion,

hey

hey

and

oral

ad-

ink

lom

ican

han

t in

nass

end-

Can-

our

ven't

hibi-

and

ne, I

bout 4

liefs

risla-

that

poli-

urch

f its

power to defend itself and its principles against hostile legislation? In Donald Blaisdell's authoritative study of pressure groups (TNEC Monograph No. 26, 1941) he lists 378 organizations with offices in Washington. Of these only eight are Catholic—mostly Departments of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

If the Catholic Hierarchy is such a powerful political factor, let my op-

ponent explain:

a) Why is it all political scientists writing on politics stress economic groups as the dominant pressuregroups and never put any great stress on religious affiliation as pressuregroups? Don't all these experts know their business?

b) If the Catholic Hierarchy is so powerful, how does it happen that we have to beg Congress for a crumb of Federal aid to education? If we had any power, there wouldn't be

any fight.

Actually, we're pitifully weak politically. We spend \$200 million a year on education, we run one-third of the general hospitals in this country (sixty per cent of the patients are non-Catholics), and yet we get practically nothing from the State.

V. CHURCH AND STATE

The charge that we do not believe in the American principle of "Separation of Church and State" is simply false.

1. We don't believe in absolute

separation, but neither do many Protestants. In fact, neither does Congress or the President.

2. Cardinal Gibbons set the tone for American Catholics when he declared in an article in the *North American Review* for March, 1909:

American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State, and I can conceive no combination of circumstances likely to arise which would make a union desirable for either

Church or state.

3. Dr. J. Pohle, a German theologian, was asked to write the article on "Toleration" for the Catholic Encyclopedia, published in New York in 1913-as Mr. Blanshard would say, with the Imprimatur of Cardinal Dr. Pohle, having gone through the same discussions in Germany, wrote his long article to show that religious freedom and the equality of sects before the law was the only just system in a country of diverse religious groups. He even said that the propositions of the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX which were in contradiction to this truth no longer applied (p. 769d).

If my opponent had tried to write an honest representation of Catholic doctrine on Church and State, instead of a diatribe on Catholicism, he might have found space in his book for these two eminent authorities, don't

you think?

I'd like to say only one last word about my opponent's charges in regard to Catholic moral teaching:

YO

to

as

in

res

to

us

to

sp

cu

pr

ra

G

th

jo th wa ha to ge

We

ha

de

of

th

1. Most of his charges are irrelevant to his subject. If people have enough religious faith to suffer rather than commit what they believe to be murder, I don't see why he should try to impose his spineless morality on them.

2. We're trying to uphold the authentic Christian moral code in a world that has lapsed into an easygoing morality of pure human convenience. Christ said anyone who even looked at a woman with adulterous desires already committed adultery in his heart. That's the basis of Catholic teaching on sex.

Christ said anyone who left his wife and married another committed adultery. That's the basis of Catholic teaching on divorce.

Christ, like Moses, said: Thou shalt not kill. This means the direct and intentional taking of the life of an innocent person. It's tragic in the extreme when a mother dies in childbirth because a Catholic doctor cannot kill the child to save the mother. But she saves her soul, and Christ said: "What will a man give in exchange for his soul?"

CONCLUSION

The upshot of all of Mr. Blanshard's charges comes down to this: it's "un-American" to believe what many Protestant scholars confess might be true—that God established the Catholic Church. It's "un-American" to have a perfectly consistent moral code based on Christ's teach moral code based on Christ's teach rig. It's "un-American" to take your religion seriously and sincerely as Catholics take the Catholic religion. It's "un-American" to be different.

In my opinion, the "un-Americanism" and "menace" to American freedom are almost entirely on Mr. Blanshard's side of this controversy, as a very perspicacious Jewish writer, Mr. David Rome, pointed out in the Gongress Bulletin (Montreal) for July, 1949 (pp. 6 ff.).

Pain Is No Fun, But . . .

"The whole problem of pain is frankly exaggerated. Recent studies in the physiology of pain show wide variation in the point at which pain becomes intolerable. Indeed, it is not at all uncommon to find a higher degree of 'pain' experienced by a relative or other onlooker than by the suffering patient. The adjustment of the individual's tolerance of pain is often phenomenal and it is a relatively rare patient who truly welcomes death merely as a release from pain even when all hope of recovery has fled."—

John F. Conlin, M.D., in the Pilot, Jan. 14, 1950.

Social Responsibilities of Business

VERY REV. LAURENCE J. McGINLEY, S.J.

An address by the President of Fordham University at the Fordham School of Business Dinner, New York, N. Y., December 3, 1949.

IT IS more than a pleasure—it is a privilege and a real honor for me to be with you tonight. I am going to take the occasion to talk to you about a subject that is very dear to my heart. I am keenly interested, as many of you know, in developing in every Fordham man a sense of responsibility, a social consciousness, toward all who walk this earth with us. For this reason I wish to speak to you tonight about the social responsibilities of business.

May

her.

rist ex-

ish-

his:

hat

fess

hed

ner-

tent

ach-

our

as

ion.

can-

can

Mr.

rsy,

iter,

the

for

t.

Our philosophy, our religion, our cultural history all instill in us one primeval fact: that the whole human race came from the hands of the one God, that we were created together, that we fell together, that we have journeyed the long road back through desert and forest, through war and peace, through famine and harvest, through ignorance and fear toward knowledge and security-together. We have a common origin; we have a common destiny; and we have a common road to walk to that destiny. These truths are the heritage of our race and civilization.

The world's attention is caught by the news. Unfortunately, these basic truths are not news. What is news. however, is the fact that during this present year business has moved forward in a realization of these basic truths. The theme of the social responsibilities of business has been outstanding in important business publications of the present year. In six recent numbers of the Harvard Business Review no less than eight major articles have stressed the obligations of businessmen to the communities which they serve. In two recent issues of Fortune, the editor has been trumpeting a message to the leaders of American business: "It is your job; it is your obligation; it is your great opportunity to provide for the social welfare of the people who depend on you."

This is a significant development in the evolution of American business thinking. It marks a growing realization that business is not merely a private adventure—it is a public trust! The manufacturer of shoes exists as a business, not merely to enable a man to make a living, to achieve some power in the industrial world, to attain to prestige because of his business skill. The primary

reason for the existence of a shoe factory is that it is essential to a community of men and women. People need shoes!

This is obvious and yet strangely enough it has taken us a long time to realize it. Somehow or other the impression prevailed that making a suit for a man to wear or bottling milk for his children, providing families with a house to live in or a newspaper to read or a radio to listen to, was a businessman's private affair. Business developed grand ideals of initiative, of risk, of efficiency, of making a thing pay; and a business venture was judged solely by these norms. A business did not exist primarily to provide food or transportation. It existed to make profit. It existed to enable the stronger to survive in a wide-open market. A man went into business solely to "get ahead." Too often men who were engaged in a business venture essential to the welfare of a community believed they had a right to call the whole thing off if it did not satisfy their own personal ambitions.

Obviously, I am not suggesting here that business should not be efficient, that it should not make a profit. But I am stating that it is wrong for a businessman to have that profit as his sole and dominant motive. Business exists to serve the community; the community does not exist to serve business. The latter at-

titude can cause tragedy and has done so in the past. For too many, when there was a choice between the business advantage of a company—e.g. a cotton mill—and the social advantage of a community, the word was: "let the community be sacrificed; let the family be sacrificed; let the worker be sacrificed. All these are expendable. Only one thing is necessary: a favorable balance on the cotton mill's statement sheet." It is this background which still prompts the remark heard today that "human welfare costs too much."

I am surely not saying this to be critical or to discredit American business. I acknowledge with everyone else the remarkable achievements of modern business. But I would point out that these achievement have not been due solely to efficiency and initiative, to daring and imagination on the part of businessmen, as is sometimes said. These achievements have also been won at a staggering cost in social distress. In 1949 people are more aware of that than ever before and they are now refusing to pay the staggering cost.

ROOT OF THE PROBLEM

Business faces a crisis, and I think that the root of the problem is this:

Heretofore too many businessmen have failed to face the social implications of the industrial civilization they have created. By and large, business has had an unfortunate recay

ne

si-

.g.

m-

ıs:

let

he

re

ec-

he

18

ots

an

be

an

its

ld

ve

nd

on

18

its

ng

0-

er

ng

nk

s:

en

li-

on

χe,

ec-

ord of short-sightedness in regard to social progress. Again and again businessmen brushed aside one welfare proposal after another with the curt comment: "impractical" or "impossible." Not so many years ago businessmen were saying it was impossible to provide healthy conditions of work. It was impossible to do without child labor. It was impossible to provide accident compensation. It was impossible to deal with labor unions. One by one these impossibilities have been whittled away and modern management finds that it is not only possible but often profitable to do these very things.

The important point is, however, that in too many cases businessmen did not take these steps because of their own initiative or forethought. They made this progress very often precisely because they were forced to it by the pressure of organized citizens, the compulsion of organized labor or by legislation. The public at large and leaders of business thought are vitally interested to see whether this history will repeat itself or whether business itself will take the initiative in solving the welfare problems of our own daystable employment, secure pension systems, subordination of industry to community needs.

There are two basic reasons why business should be vitally aware of its social responsibility to solve our current welfare problems. The first

reason is this: by and large, business itself has caused many of those problems. The second reason is that unless business finds the solution for those problems, business itself will not survive as a free enterprise.

MORAL OBLIGATION

I say by and large that business has caused many of our present social problems. The industrial system in which we now live and which has been brought about by business more than by any other agency has shaken human life loose from every safe and secure mooring that it once had. It has made cities dependent on railroads, families dependent on automobiles, rubber and gasoline. It has bound up the whole of our lives in a complicated maze of steel rails, copper wires, express highways, middlemen merchants and radio antennae. The social institutions of a simpler age, in which men once found peace of mind and social satisfaction, have been taken away and little of lasting spiritual significance has come to take their place. Because it has created this industrial system-which with all its benefits has left a legacy of insecurity, dissatisfaction, and fear-business surely has a moral obligation to provide a rich and satisfying social life for the people it has made dependent on it. This is one reason why business itself must help find the solution of today's welfare problems.

The other reason is this: today men will no longer live without that solution. If private business fails to provide it, then private business will be forced to yield to government control. The problem is, therefore, not whether business will survive in competition with business, but whether any business will survive at all in the face of social change.

As businessmen, your first responsibility is to the society of men among whom you operate. Ultimately they will decide whether you will exist or not. And if business has learned anything it has learned this, that ordinary citizens will not allow business to survive unless they can survive with it.

This brings me back to the point with which I started. It is significant. I think, that businessmen are beginning to realize more and more that their enterprise is not merely a productive operation: it is an integral part of a community. They are beginning to realize better and better that they must provide something more than Frigidaires and Pontiacs and nylons they must provide leadership in the business of living itself. They have a right to exercise their talents, their flair for risk and enterprise, not to build a private empire of coal or steel, but a social empire of living men who find in the result of their work the satisfaction of a genuine and healthy social life.

These thoughts have prompted

business thinkers to re-examine the basis on which all modern business exists. In the words of the Dean of the Harvard Business School, there is a "deep concern, almost a ferment in the minds of many—especially businessmen themselves—regarding the ethical and moral foundation of our industrial civilization."

MEMBERS OF ONE BODY

All that I have said must have a far more profound meaning to the students of the Fordham School of Business. Here we are, as Catholics have always been, bound together by Grace as members of the living Body of Christ. All of us, whether employers or employes, salesmen or customers, government officials or obedient citizens, all of us share the same divine life and are nourished by the same Body and Blood of Christ. This community of religious life in Christ must express itself in a community of social life in the modern world.

Do not underestimate the possibility of expressing the greatest of Christian virtues in modern business. You really clothe the naked when you operate a garment shop. You really feed the hungry when you manage an A. & P. store. You really shelter the homeless if you are engaged in the work of a building contractor. The highest ideal of a modern businessman is the ideal of a true Christian: to serve men in the Name

of Christ. If you can have that ideal counting, marketing and business for your dominant motive as you management will have been well leave Fordham's business school, worthwhile. Otherwise they will have then all our patient efforts with ac- been largely a waste of time.

Not by Bread Alone

"In 1923, nine of the most successful businessmen of the U. S. held a meeting in a hotel in a Midwestern city. They were:

The president of the largest independent steel company.

The president of the largest utility company. The president of the largest gas company.

The greatest wheat speculator.

The president of the New York Stock Exchange.

A member of the President's cabinet. The greatest "bear" on Wall Street. The head of the world's largest monopoly.

The president of the Bank of International Settlements.

"Twenty-five years later the world's most successful financiers and industrialists had the following record:

"The president of the largest independent steel company-Charles Schwab—died a bankrupt and lived on borrowed money for five years before his death.

The president of the greatest utility company-Samuel Insull-died penniless in a foreign land.

The president of the largest gas company—Howard Hopson—is now insane.

The president of the New York Stock Exchange-Richard Whitneywas recently released from Sing Sing penitentiary.

The greatest wheat speculator—Arthur Cutten—died abroad, insolvent. The member of the president's cabinet—Albert Fall—was pardoned from prison so he could die at home.

The greatest "bear" on Wall Street-Jesse Livermore-died a snicide. The President of the Bank of International Settlements-Leon Fraserdied a suicide."-Sister Mary Gregoria, B.V.M., in CATHOLIC BUSINESS EDUCATION REVIEW. November, 1949.

Are We Really Against Communism?

HAROLD R. McKINNON

Reprinted from the American Bar Association Journal*

THE history of this country's reaction to Communism illustrates the confusion that results when expediency is substituted for principle in human affairs.

The confusion in this instance is such that an independent observer might seriously question whether as a nation we are really against Communism after all. Let us look at the facts.

Communism originated in a philosophy that was first made known a hundred years ago. This was the philosophy of Marx and Engels, which was later developed by various disciples, notably Lenin and Stalin. It was not a secret doctrine but a world-wide call to a revolution, with a popular literature and open emissaries. It emerged from the talking stage when its leaders seized control of the Russian State, a seizure of power, by the way, that was not a revolt against the Czar, but against the democratic regime of Kerensky. Following this success, the movement revealed to the world its methods, which were shockingly opposed to Anglo-American principles of liberty and justice. These methods included imprisonment and execution of political opponents, suppression of the freedoms of religion and speech, and an intellectual and moral slavery that is unparalleled in modern history.

After this revelation of Communism, in theory and in action, what did we do?

AMERICA REFUSES TO RECOGNIZE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

First, we refused to recognize the Soviet Government. The grounds for our action were stated by President Wilson, who declared that "in the view of this . Government there can not be any common ground upon which it can stand with a Power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense," and who also said that we could not hold relations with "a government which is determined . . . to conspire against our institutions, whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt, whose spokesmen say they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them." The same views were expressed by President Coolidge, who added: "I do not propose to barter away for the privilege of trade any of the cherished rights of humanity. I do not propose to make merchandise of any American principles."

After sixteen years of such intransigence, we recognized the Soviets. This was done by a letter from President Roosevelt to Mr. Litvinoff in which the President expressed the desire to reestablish normal diplomatic relations, and added: "I trust that the relations now established between our peoples may forever remain normal and friendly, and that our nations henceforth may cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the preservation of the peace of the world."

COMMUNISTS WERE ACCEPTED AS POLITICAL PARTY

Next, we accepted the Communists as a party in our national political life. Its candidates ran for public office, including that of President of the United States. Their names appeared on our ballots, side by side with those of the historic American political parties. And their appeal for votes was based upon the doctrines of their party, the Communist Party.

Then we witnessed with indifference, if not with approval, the invasion of government, labor unions and other organizations by Communists and their supporters. In some cases, the presence of the Communists was indicated by unmistakable signs; in

others, it should have been suspected. But resistance was lacking, and utilizing an easily won hospitality the party imbedded itself almost inextricably in our political and social institutions.

We then became allied with the Soviet Union in a war against tyranny and oppression, although we knew that conquest and subjection were routine Soviet tactics. We had observed these tactics. They had been demonstrated in the denial of civil liberties within the Soviet Union, and in the successive subjugations of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland, the last of which we had viewed with appropriate indignation in Robert Sherwood's play, There Shall Be No Night.

We pursued that alliance after the war's end. In cooperation with the Soviet Government, we acquiesced in the enslavement of some of the peoples for whose freedom the war had professedly been fought. And our representatives sat with Russians on courts that tried people for collaborating with the Nazis, after Stalin had entered into a pact with Hitler and had said that that pact represented a friendship cemented with blood, and after Molotov had said of Fascism that it was just a matter of taste.

Now suddenly, all is changed. Men who ran for public office on the Communist ticket are being prosecuted for pursuing party objectives. Public officials who were charged over ten years ago with being Communists are now being investigated and tried, and loyalty boards are screening the rosters of public employees for the detection of Communists in the civil service ranks. Union leaders whose adherence to the party line has been a notorious fact for many years are suddenly denounced and expelled from the organizations that housed and made use of them. Official fact-finding bodies are flushing out the Communists from the masses of our citizens. Loyalty oaths are being prescribed for educators. Radio dramas are broadcasting the evil thing in our midst. And all through the country there sweeps like a wave a great revulsion which was not there before

What acounts for this sudden reversal of sentiment, both public and private?

Obviously, it was no new discovery of Communist aims or tactics, because, as we have seen, the philosophy of Communism is a hundred years old, and its tactics have been demonstrated for decades. For example, when Earl Browder ran for President, we knew then, as well as later when we released him from prison while ordinary convicts served out their terms, that he stood for the violent overthrow of this Republic. And when we looked with an amiable toleration at the heated crusades

of Mr. William Z. Foster, we knew the fact, which he later conceded to a congressional committee, that the Communists in America look upon the Soviet Union as their country and that they have only one flag and that that is the red flag of Soviet Russia. And when the government and labor unions harbored and employed such men or their associates, we knew as well as we know now that their objectives were the same as those we now find so wicked and revolting. What, then, has happened to us? For it must be ourselves who have changed; the Communists haven't.

PRESENT POSITION IS RESULT OF SOVIET MILITARY POWER

It is evident that our present position is not one of principle, but of expediency. The difference between the former situation and the present one is that the Soviet Union, which before was weak, is now a military threat of the first magnitude. Furthermore, it is on the march; and it has the atomic bomb; and its jet planes are the fastest in the world.

These things make a difference. A country which possesses these things must be resisted, philosophy and all.

The defect in this reasoning is that the military threat is something quite distinct from the philosophy. We met a military threat in 1917 when we were allied with Japan, Italy and Russia. And we have recently

emerged from another military contest, in which were were opposed by countries possessing such divergent philosophies as Japan, Italy and Germany and in which we were an ally of the Soviet Union, which possessed a philosophy that was basically hostile to what was traditional in our culture. In other words, we have not fought wars on the basis of philosophies but on that of national survival. By the same token, war, or the threat of war, should not determine our philosophy, either in respect of what we stand for or what we stand against.

The test of our present position is this. What would happen to our attitude towards Communism if the Soviet military threat were suddenly removed?

There is nothing in the history of our relations with Communism that enables us to say that we would not revert to our former apathy and indifference. Anyone who would contradict this will have to meet the burden of explaining our national policy prior to 1945, especially prior to the war. It simply will not do to say that the war enlightened us, because Communist doctrine and practices had been amply disclosed prior to World War II.

If these conclusions are correct, they present a challenging problem. It is a problem much more important than how to checkmate a military peril. It is the problem of preserving our principles, on which every-

THE DOCTRINE OF COMMUNISM IS ANTI-GOD

Instead of the Soviet Union as a military power, let us look for a moment at the Communist doctrine. It is anti-God, and therefore wholly unprincipled from its foundation, because without God there is no source of moral obligation. It maintains that matter is the only reality and that therefore all spiritual values are fictitious. It says that man is motivated by economic forces, the present manifestation of which is the class struggle. Instead of a solution of that struggle by just relations achieved through cooperation, it believes in aggravating the struggle with a view to the world-wide triumph of the proletariat by a liquidation, through all available measures, of the property owner. It says that the only certain and reliable guide is the collective consciousness of the proletariat, and that the convictions, hopes and aspirations of individuals are subject to extinction insofar as they conflict with the proletarian gospel. It is not a crime, therefore, to force confessions, or to exile or execute dissenters; nor is there anything wrong in committing forgery or perjury, or in suddenly contradicting the most solemn expressions of doctrine or policy, provided such tactics promote the revolution.

Our rejection of these doctrines should not imply that modern society is immune from criticism. On the contrary, it must be conceded that workers and racial minorities have been subjected to grave injustices in this country as well as elsewhere; that capitalism has sinned grievously and has shown little disposition to repent without coercion; and that the habit of boasting about political democracy is semi-blind as long as that democracy is accompanied in the economic sphere by masses of propertyless wage earners dependent for their livelihoods upon the caprices of their masters. These historic antecedents to the Communist uprising have contributed to its dynamic quality. But that fact does not in any way lessen the evil of Communism, which would substitute for a regime that stands in need of reformation another regime that is intrinsically vicious because it is based upon a degraded philosophy of man.

It is on this point—a sane view of man—that America must regain its orientation regarding Communism if it is to replace its recent confusion and contradictions with a steady, consistent attitude. More than this, principles are the fundamental source of our strength in the world peril, and by the same token we shall be fundamentally weak if we abandon our principles in favor of a day-to-day expediency reflecting the gymnastics of the Communist party line.

A nation can stand defeat in a war; if it has principles, it will rise again. But a nation that is wrong in principle is doomed without a war, because it has destroyed itself in advance.

Of all peoples, we are least in need of shifting with every turn of the tide of fortune. The reason is that our nation was founded upon principles which, if steadfastly maintained, in thought and deed, will serve as a bulwark against the transient wickedness of such a thing as Communism. These are the truths that are recorded in our Declaration of Independence: that God exists: that men are spiritual beings who possess rights that are the direct endowment of their Creator; and that the purpose of government is to secure these God-given rights. Implicit in these propositions are the further truths that man is not a product of economic forces or of the state, but that he possesses a dignity that is inalienable because it transcends the wills of men; that beyond all manmade laws there is a higher law to which all government is subject; and that peace is the fruit not of victory in the class conflict but of justice serving the common good of free and rational beings.

Our waverings with regard to Communism are indications that we have lost the deep significance of these principles. Our course, therefore, is plain. It is to regain these truths and to implement them in our se

d

le

at

11

13

8

n

society if we are to preserve our heritage against an alien way of life.

The primary contest is on the issue of religion. That issue is primary because religion is primary. And religion is primary because unless man recognizes his obligation to his Creator, man makes his own moral law, and in that case the morality of the Communists has as much validity as that of their opponents. Religion is primary for the further reason that unless men possess the motivating power of religion they will be unable to match the dynamic quality of the Communist credo. Therefore, if we do not stop Communism on the issue of religion, there is no assurance that we will do so on any other.

The next issue is closely akin to that of religion. It is that of the spiritual character of man. For unless we see man as made in the image of God, with a spiritual destiny that transcends the life of the body, there is no basis for treating him differently from animals. The perilous state of our thinking on this subject is indicated by the remark of the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who said that he saw "no reason for attributing to man a significance different in kind from that which belongs to a baboon or to a grain of sand." It is also indicated by a joint declaration of beliefs of a large number of American intellectual leaders, including the famous educator John Dewey, in which the authors said,

"the time has passed for theism [and] deism"; "the universe is self-existing and not created"; "man is a part of nature and has emerged as the result of a continuous process"; "the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected"; and "modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values."

The fact is that we will never be truly opposed to Communism unless we see in every man, regardless of his race or station in life, a dignity that flows from the spiritual character and essential equality that are described in our Declaration of Independence. That is the real basis for habeas corpus as against slave labor camps, and for freedom of thought as against a servile adherence to the party line. If in the past it had also inspired a greater respect for the workingman, it might have averted some retaliations by labor now; and if it had provided just treatment for minority races, it might have prevented some members of such groups from seeking the solace of Communist associations.

CORPORATE OWNERSHIP A FORM OF COLLECTIVISM

On the issue of property, we are under a delusion if we think we are prevailing in that contest while more property is coming under corporate ownership and wage-earners possess nothing but their wages, even though those wages be fair. A stock certificate in a large corporation is not private property in any real sense of the term. It is a right to protect the receipt of dividends by registering a vote in a collectivism that is a halfway mark between private property and public ownership. And a propertyless wage earner is by that very fact a proletarian. Unless we find some way to reverse this trend, and to bring about a broad distribution of ownership of property in the hands of individuals, we shall find ourselves fulfilling a prediction of Karl Marx that capitalism tends toward the collectivism against which it struggles. We cannot ignore that challenge any longer.

On the issue of the omnipotent state, we similarly delude ourselves if we think we are opposing the Soviet doctrine by a concept of state that substitutes a spoon-fed security for a decent self-reliance. Communism substitutes government for private initiative. We can oppose it in this respect only by espousing the doctrine that the state should supplement and aid the maximum efforts of individuals and private associations, not seek to displace those efforts by public administration. We similarly invoke the thing that we would avoid if we cannot solve the problem of capital and labor by just relations voluntarily achieved, instead of by the intervention of government, which would be destructive of the freedom of labor as well as of owner.

Finally, we struggle in vain against any external threat to our society if we witness with complacency the breakdown of the social unit which is the family. Communism began with a rejection of the family. Reports indicate that the results were so disastrous that it had to reverse itself on that point and seek to stabilize what it had tried to destroy. The disintegration of the family in America has reached the point where progress may depend upon our imitating the Communist procedure in this respect.

CRUX OF THE MATTER IS PRINCIPLES

The crux of the matter is principles. With a sound program of principles, we can really oppose Communism: without one, we cannot, in spite of the energy of our denunciations and the vigor of our prosecutions. I have proposed a minimum program of such principles. It includes the recognition of religion as the primary value and of the spiritual nature of man as the basis of justice and human brotherhood, the restoration of private property on a popular scale, the acknowledgment of the moral limitations of the civil power and of the true function of the state as an aid to private initiative, and the preservation of the family as the basis of social integrity.

The maintenance of such princi-

ples does not imply that we need not take all legitimate measures for our protection, including elimination of Communists from responsible organizations and their prosecution for violations of the law. But with such principles we shall have something to protect and without them we shall not. Another result will be that our attitude towards our enemies will not vary from year to year but will be "an ever-fixed mark that looks on tempests, and is never shaken." Above all, the possession of such principles will be a sign that we are solicitous first about our soul; and it was because this country at its birth thought first about its soul that it became the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Euthanasia in Germany

"The practice of medicine has always presupposed an intimate and direct relation between doctor and patient. The doctor's first, if not his major and only, obligation is to the patient, and not to any environing political or economic group. The Nazis changed all that. The whole political morality of the Nazi regime, harking back to leads given by Hegel, assumed that the State is the center of values. Its citizens are of worth only as they contribute to its welfare. Even before the Nazis took open charge of Germany, propaganda was directed against the traditional compassionate nineteenth-century attitudes toward the chronically ill, and for the adoption of a utilitarian. Hegelian point of view. Bavarian psychiatrists in 1931 were publicly discussing sterilization and euthanasia of persons with chronic mental illnesses. By 1936, three years before war broke out, German medical journals were mentioning, as a matter of course, extermination of the physically or socially unfit. Children in the schools were indoctrinated with these ideas. In September 1936, Hitler issued an order for euthanasia. All State hospitals and institutions were to report on patients who had been ill for five years or more and who were unable to work. Professors of psychiatry at the leading universities saw the reports and decided on the cases, without ever seeing the patients. Similar reports were submitted, looking to the killing of unpromising children. A 'charitable Transport Company for the Sick' carried patients to the killing centers. The records show that prior to all the butchering of Jews and prisoners, 275,000 Germans were put to death at these centers."—Willard L. Sperry in The American Mercury, March, 1950.

Right and Left

DON CAPELLANO

Reprinted from THE LABOR LEADER*

MANY people accept the label "RIGHT" as representing a morally right point of view and particularly a Catholic point of view. They are also likely to believe that anything labeled "LEFT" is anti-Christian and anti-American. Fakers on both sides have made good use of this confusion.

Jeoffrey Crowther, the distinguished editor of the London Economist, is very likely to know the social and historical difference between "Right" and "Left." He says in a recent article:

We are witnessing within our own democracies a great struggle of ideas. Western industrial civilization, as we know it, grew up under the domination of a system of ideas that we now call those of the RIGHT. It was a system of ideas that exalted material progress and production, and under it more wealth has been created than was ever before imagined. But it was a system that took relatively little notice of the miseries and the injustices that were the price of its progress. We have therefore in the last generation seen the rise of the opposite doctrines of the LEFT, which exalt the security and social welfare of the individual, even at the cost of economic efficiency and the maximum creation of wealth.

This is one of the greatest antitheses of our time, which reappears in innumerable guises. It is the antithesis between progress and security, between the efficiency of the economic system and its equity. It is the contrast between the gospel of work and the endowment of leisure, between the premium that our fathers put upon thrift and the stimulus that the present

age gives to consumption.

I do not believe that any of us can afford to be fundamentalists in this conflict. Life would be easier if one could say that one order of ideas was wholly right and the other wholly wrong. But I do not think it is so. There must be both elements in our twentieth-century society, and we shall spend the rest of our lives learning how they can be trained to double harness.

The Harmony Between Science and Religion

JAMES A. REYNIERS

An address at the annual Communion Breakfast of the Notre Dame Club of New York, December 11, 1949.

A LTHOUGH I have been requested to discuss the harmony between Science and Religion, I must confess that I know no good reason why there should be disharmony; and in my own experience have encountered none.

Science is a way of thinking; an inquiry into the laws of nature. At its best, it is objective but alert to the nuances of other paths to reason. It attempts to explain a phenomenon in such a way that the phenomenon can be brought under control and reproduced in whole, or in part, and thus fitted into the natural scheme of things. The aim of science is always truth. It flourishes best where freedom exists to carry on this search for truth. It fades when it is made to become a tool for special interests whatever these interests might be. Science on a basic level is exploratory; on an applied level, it is utilitarian.

Religion is a belief binding man to a supernatural Being. It is concerned with knowing this Being, with expressing a feeling of dependence on Him, establishing an ethical pattern of living. The pursuit of religious knowledge may be just as logical, just as objective and just as systematic as science. In religion, we seek to know God largely on a spiritual or metaphysical level. In science, the same final objective may be reached through the study of the laws of nature as they exist in their magnificent order; but when we seek to know God through science, it is not directly as in religion, but indirectly.

Thus, science and religion each have their objectives, separate paths to travel in reaching such objectives and special disciplines for doing so. There should be no conflict between the two and no disharmony.

Indeed for Catholics, this has been clearly stated by Pius XI. In setting up the Papal Academy of Science (1936) he said:

Science which is truly science is never in opposition to the truths of the Christian faith; indeed—and this is a fact that must necessarily be conceded by anyone who has ever looked into the history of the various sciences—just as the Roman Pontiffs and the Church frequently furthered the experimental

19

de

ar

CC

ba

h

u

investigations of men of science, so in their turn did these scientific investigations prove to be a mighty bulwark protecting the treasury of spiritual truth entrusted to the same Church . . . Wherefore, as the Vatican Council solemnly teaches: "Not only do faith and reason not contradict one another, but on the contrary they complement each other, since right reason demonstrates the fundamentals of faith, and illumined by its light advances the knowledge of divine truths; while faith frees and protects reason from errors of all sorts, and enhances right reason with its own considerable science."

There seems to be no further need to labor this point, for while this is Catholic teaching, there is no reason to think it should differ essentially for any other religious group. If both science and religion seek truth, there can be no conflict simply because this is the ultimate toward which the human mind can strive. Nor is there any good reason why both paths cannot be followed by any man—not one or the other, but both.

SCIENCE AND MORAL VALUES

If any conflict exists between science and religion, it is based on fear resulting from the misuse of scientific discoveries as applied to the lives of people. This is quite a different thing than the fear of science as a method or a discipline. It is inevitable that as religion touches the lives of men in their behavior, so does science. Here lies a whole area which needs study and, above all, mutual understanding between science.

the public and religion. As long as there is science and as long as people demand from science new weapons, they must be prepared to accept the responsibility that goes with owning or using these weapons. It is exactly at this point that ethics, moral values and religion must be brought in, because it is not the business of science to decide these values.

This does not mean, of course, that the scientist should not try to understand and even discuss these values as they apply to his work. But, unless he is prepared to enter especially those fields which comprise ethics and moral values, he cannot speak authoritatively. This is no strange situation, for by the same token an atomic physicist or a biologist will seek and follow medical advice when he is ill, and does not expect to deal competently with medical problems unless he is prepared to acquire the necessary knowledge and experience. What has been said of the scientist is also true of the religious; who, if he is to speak authoritatively in science, must also be a scientist.

So, I cannot see why there should be disharmony between true science and religion or why there should be any basic conflict within the scientist. There is nothing to prevent anyone from being at the same time a good scientist and a deeply religious man. As a matter of fact, we have many examples of this in such great men of science as Pasteur and Mendel, who actively practiced science and their religion without known conflict.

Like so many other things, the basic problem is one of understanding, mutual respect and trust. We have all been taught to fear the products of technology and to look somewhat obliquely at science as a menace. However, for every fearful thing we see in science, there is also something of hope-for every atom bomb, the prevention of disease; for every evil a good if we are willing to seek it. If we as a people demand only physical comforts from science, we must be prepared to accept the responsibilities of this. If we choose to make science a master rather than a servant in our lives, it is entirely and completely our choice. We are to blame, not science.

PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

We can just as well use science as it should be used, to explore the universe and its order, or in the same way as we use art and music or poetry, as a stimulation to higher truths which we dimly see. The philosophy of science has been much neglected by scientists and others; and yet in this field probably lies the future of science, the new horizons, the bridges over which many may freely pass to bring order, understanding and peace to all. There was a time when science was as close to the minds of men in their daily lives

as it is close today to their physical well being. When science again becomes an intellectual need and is valued first because of its search for truth rather than its usefulness, we will be much closer to the early promise it offered to the lives of man, much closer to the golden age of freedom from want.

If science is to be properly used, the burden lies first on the shoulders of every individual member of society and then on the groups of which he is a member. Just as the results of scientific research are shared by everyone, no matter who makes a discovery, so the use, good or bad, to which these discoveries are put must be the responsibility of all. There is no turning back on the path which science has traveled-we have gone too far for that. We can only hope to straighten this path into the future so that it leads to the real objective for which science was ordained. It seems doubtful that this can be done without much suffering, but what is very certain is that we cannot abandon this path no matter how much we regret having taken it. We are living with science and will live with it into the future.

If there is no essential disharmony between science and religion; if the use to which science is put is a responsibility of every individual and every group, because such usage is unavoidably shared by everyone, then it seems proper at this time to con-

19

sider the situation as it concerns

CATHOLIC CONTRIBUTION

For Catholics, there is no religious reason why science should not be fostered and encouraged, especially in the institutions of higher learning which are under Catholic auspices in this country. As a matter of fact, there is an obligation to do so, to the Church, the government and the people of the country. As a group, Catholics cannot expect to voice their opinions of scientific research with authority unless they participate in producing research in proportion to their potential. They are not doing this in certain fields in their institutions of higher learning. As evidence of this, let us take two examples and measure the Catholic contribution in terms of participation in private and public funds for research; this, on the basis that Catholic institutions participate in these funds in proportion to their desire or ability to do so and not in proportion to their right to share in these funds. The right to share is not disputed.

Example No. 1. Cancer has been for some time a national problem. In 1949-50, some \$10,000,000 was spent on cancer research in this country. Of this sum, the Catholic institutions received approximately \$61,000 with seven institutions sharing this sum. This could mean that only seven Catholic institutions were organized

to enter into cancer research. It could also mean that only seven institutions wanted to participate in cancer research and only for .61 per cent of the total sum.

In the November 25 issue of Science (V. 110, p. 576, 1949), the National Cancer Institute announced the awarding of grants totaling \$907,212 to thirty non-Federal hospitals and universities in this country. Two of these were Catholic with a total grant of \$9,000, or less than one per cent of the sum available. In the same issue, the Damon-Runyon Fund announced grants of \$101,000 to eight institutions—one of which is Catholic. It received \$25,000, or in this case 24 per cent of the grants.

Example No. 2. According to published figures of the National Research Council for 1946 (Pleasants and Bauer, 1946), 302 industrial companies distributed 1800 fellowships to 120 institutions of learning as scholarships or grants-in-aid for research with a total expenditure of \$22,000,000. Of these 1800 grants, only 3 were made to Catholic institutions. In other words, while approximately 15 per cent of the non-Catholic institutions qualified for outside assistance, only 2 per cent of the Catholic institutions qualified. The grants made to the Catholic institutions totalled approximately \$55,000. Eight grants out of 1800, or about 1/2 of 1 per cent of total industrial assistance went to Catholic colleges. Yet they constitute 19 per cent of the colleges in this country.

While these examples are limited, they may be supported much more comprehensively from other published studies ranging from Lehman and Witty (*Scientific Monthly*, 1931) to the symposium "Catholics and Scholarship" edited by Rev. John F. O'Brien (1938).

The plain fact is that up to 1938 Catholics in their institutions of learning had not contributed their full share to scientific research; and while some improvement has undoubtedly occurred, we still lag behind.

Lest this be misinterpreted by some as an indication that "the tenets of the Catholic Church are not consonant with scientific endeavor," or that my purpose is to embarrass, I would like to make clear that my interest is in the production of scientific research, which I believe is frou a common good no matter what group does the research. If this discussion can serve to stimulate that research among Catholic institutions, it serves science, the people and the Catholic group.

It seems to me then that the first question which should be opened to discussion among Catholics is whether Catholics want to contribute to scientific research through their institutions of higher learning. It is quite possible that they wish to make their contributions to learning

in other fields. It comes down to a matter of evaluating the importance of science in the scheme of things. This question is basic to the problem and should be discussed and weighed carefully. However, if the answer is negative, it must be noted that Catholics forfeit the opportunity to speak authoritatively in science. If we wish to carry conviction, it is necessary to do so through recognized scientists, through proper contributions to scientific research, in scientific gatherings and as scientists. If the answer is affirmative, the question logically follows as to why Catholics have not taken the necessary means.

APATHY AMONG CATHOLICS

So far as I can determine, Catholic institutions want to contribute to scientific research; but one of the common reasons given for not doing so is a lack of funds. While this may be the situation in some instances, it is by no means the most important reason. Nor does it offer an excuse for the apparent apathy toward starting research. The right to available funds must be earned.

I think a more basic reason is lack of Catholic interest and pride in Catholic institutions and scientists. Until the Catholic population, both religious and lay, learn to respect their scholars and take pride in their contributions to humanity, until they learn that such contributions are free gifts to all mankind and demand sacrifices, this situation will exist. Scientists and scholars who do not have the affection, respect and trust of the group in which they labor will simply leave that group and be absorbed by other groups. These intangibles are far more important than money because respect brings trust, which in turn brings freedom—the lifeblood of science.

STIMULATING RESEARCH

Let us now turn for a moment to the problem of what to do to stimulate research among Catholics and in Catholic institutions. A broad first step has already been taken with the interest shown by Pius XI. By reforming the Papal Academy of Science in 1936, he set an example for Catholics the world over.

In this country, a simple start might be made by giving a medal annually to a distinguished scientist, or some sign of recognition similar to the Mendel Award of Villanova or the Laetare Medal given by Notre Dame. Such an award, if given strictly on a basis of scientific merit with proper ceremony and publicity, could mean much. It need not carry a stipend. It seems to me that on a national basis this might well be considered a proper function of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, or on an international basis a function of the Papal Academy of Science.

Another step could be taken by a member, or members, of the hierarchy who, because of their background and special interest in science, might well become patrons of the sciences in the older tradition of the Church. Their voice and encouragement could very well become a rallying point to which scientists, laboring under Catholic auspices, could turn when confronted with special problems requiring sympathy and understanding.

Finally, and for this country at least, Catholic educational institutions can themselves do much to foster research. Here again the simplest and best procedure would be for administrators to give encouragement to bright young men by freeing them of some of the teaching load in proportion to their merit and promise. With a little recognition and encouragement, these young scholars would surprise us by their accomplishments.

In closing, it seems to me that Catholic institutions, by virtue of their lack of scientific traditions, are in the extremely important position of being able to concentrate on basic science. At this level, there is no competition. The world and nature are as open now as they were centuries ago.

Life is still a mystery although we pound at it with cyclotrons, analyze it with tremendous chemical instrumentation and examine it through expensive electron microscopes. The human mind, with God-given curiosity and the desire to understand His creation, is always capable of forming a new tool as simple as an innoculating needle or of seeing through eyes sharpened by desire.

With all of this, how can there be

anything but harmony between science and religion where every experiment, if we choose to make it so, may be a prayer for better understanding of the magnificent order around us? What is there to fear if we seek the truth?

Contemplative Life

"Since the contemplative life implies an uncompromising denial and rejection of all the values which most people in the world actually live by, it is generally called anti-social. That is manifestly false. The chief nourishment and source of Christian contemplation is precisely the liturgy, which is a communal activity of worship, social by its very nature, centered upon certain social 'signs' or Sacraments, the chief of which, the Holy Eucharist, or the Body and Blood of Christ, is the Sacramentum unitatis, perfecting the union of all the faithful with one another and with God in one love and in the Mystical Body of Christ. Those who dedicate themselves by vow to the contemplative life in religious communities find themselves leading the most strictly communal and social kind of life it would be possible to imagine, and the last man who should be accepted in a contemplative monastery is a misanthrope! If you are anti-social by temperament, for pity's sake never enter a Trappist monastery: you will go cray in ten minutes."—Thomas Merton in the Dublin Review, Winter, 1949.

Unionism in India

"One can hardly say that the trade unions in India are strong. Most of them, because of a lack of funds, are little more than "strike committees." The rank and file of labor look to them for improvement of their financial condition—and that is all. When there is no question of a strike, membership of the union falls off. As the unions weaken, management often succumbs to the temptation to take advantage of the situation until rising dissatisfaction again strengthens the union. And so it goes."—Thomas Q. Enright, S.J. in Social Order, November 1949.

Stalin's Plan for U.S. Negroes

WILLIAM A. NOLAN, S.J.

Reprinted from Interracial Review*

RECENTLY, the communist and pro-communist activities some Negroes may have given an impression which is quite inaccurate. As an example, let us take the trial of the twelve communist leaders in New York City. Two of them were Negroes. One out of five defense lawyers was also a Negro. A Negro "expert" witness against the New York Federal jury system was on the stand for eleven days straight. Then came the series of demonstrations by Paul Robeson: his remarks in Paris to the effect that Negroes would not fight against Russia, if need be, and his two Peekskill performances. Of course, there was the wonderful counter-testimony by Jackie Robinson, Lester B. Granger and other Negro leaders. But unfortunately, the evil that men do is more often remembered than the good. It is unfortunate that this is all the more liable to occur when the men are Negroes.

The simple truth is that extremely few Negroes are, or have ever been, Communists. The Communist Party wants Negroes very badly, but Negroes definitely do not want communism. In the hope of attracting new candidates, the Communist Party

pushes a few Negroes to the top and keeps them in the public eye. This explains how there were disproportionately so many Negroes on display at the treason trial in New York City.

Up to the time of the Wallace movement, much less than one per cent of Negroes in the United States was ever strongly influenced by communist propaganda. And most of those who were strongly influenced in one way or another did not belong to the Party itself, but were, for a time, more or less innocently deceived by communist-front organizations. According to the testimony of witnesses at the communist trial, the Wallace movement was a communistcontrolled affair from start to finish. Its platform, however, was presented in such a way that uneducated or emotionally upset people might easily be fooled. There are no complete statistics on how many Negroes voted for Wallace, who received 2.4 per cent of the entire presidential vote. In New York City, proportionately more whites than Negroes voted for Wallace. And in Mississippi, he received about 150 votes. Even if all these were Negro votes, the figure would still be astonishingly small.

Although the Communist Party in the United States was formed in September, 1919, communist activities among Negroes were very slow in getting under way. The early Communist Party in this country was extremely foreign in its outlook, and for a long time took little interest in native American problems. So weird at times was the character of communist activity among Negroes that the ordinary American reader would have much difficulty in following it, perhaps even in believing it at all. From its beginning in September, 1919, until the summer of 1928, the Communist Party in this country paid little attention to Negroes. But in the second half of 1928, after Stalin had eliminated his competitors for power, the Comintern got down to business on the American Negro question and sent over a very detailed directive as to what was to be done about it. An idea of how independent the activity of the Communist Party in this country is can be gleaned from the declaration of Earl Browder that, until Stalin explained the Negro question to American Communists, they were unable to understand it. Very likely, Stalin has not met more than a few hundred Negroes in his entire life.

The 1928 directive of the Comintern, which was Stalin's pipe-line to foreign countries, told the American Communists that they must get busy among Negroes and that they must promote two main slogans about

them: 1) "Equal Rights," 2) "Self-determination in the Black Belt." For Communists everywhere, the slogan is the official unit of propaganda. Extraordinary importance is attached by communist leaders to promotion of the right kind of slogans, as if they had some strange magical power of producing any desired result.

As for the two main slogans which were to be publicized among Negroes. the first one about "equal rights" offered no difficulty to the American interpreters of Comintern strategy. But the other main slogan-"Self-determination in the Black Belt"proved to be a weird importation from eastern Europe. When it was first sent over from Moscow, Ben Gitlow, then a top-ranking Party member, was campaigning in the South for the 1928 presidential election. The doctrine of self-determination in the Black Belt struck him with all the refreshing effect of an axeblow betwen the eyes. At once, he appealed to the "C.I. rep"-that is, to the official representative of the Comintern, or, to be more precise, to Stalin's supreme agent in this country. The "C.I. rep." outranks all the dummy top officers of the Party, such as the eleven who went on trial in New York City.

STALIN'S AGENT REPORTS

At that time, Stalin's chief agent happened to be a Hungarian known in this country under the name of

19

Pepper. The exact words of Pepper's reply to Gitlow show how independent American Communists are in their dealing with Negroes:

Comrade Gitlow, there is much truth in what you say; but we could not help ourselves in Moscow. The Russians on the Commission could only see the American Negro question in the light of the minorities question which existed in Russia before the Revolution. Had we not fallen in line, we would have been severely condemned as deviators and khvostists who neglect work among the Negro masses.

SELF-DETERMINATION

Just what was this business of selfdetermination in the Black Belt which the Kremlin masters exported for the consumption of American Negroes? Briefly, it meant that Negroes in the South were to regard themselves as a nation distinct from the rest of Americans, and that they should exercise their right to determine their own political independence by setting up a Negro Soviet Republic below the Mason-Dixon line. The entire business sounded not only impossible, but also absurd. However, Stalin had decided that Negroes in the South were a separate nation. This meant that discussion of the problem was finished. Now, all loval comrades must carry out the directive of their Supreme Leader.

In this slogan of self-determination, Stalin was merely applying to Negroes in the South a program which he himself had worked out at Lenin's bidding, back in 1913. In old Russia, the bulk of communist support was scattered among what we in this country would call minorities. Lenin, therefore, ordered Stalin, who belonged to the Georgian minority group, to work out a program which might win over the sympathies of the minorities of old Russia. Much can be said in favor of Stalin's proposal as an effective piece of propaganda for Russia. The trouble was that he concluded, against plenty of evidence at his disposal, that what was good enough for Russia ought to be good enough for Negroes in the South. Stalin, of course, knew very well what he hoped to gain from demanding that the Communist Party in this country push the program of selfdetermination in the South. On the basis of their distinct "nationhood." Negroes were to demand the right to secede and form a separate State. If the whites resisted, then Negroes must take up arms in defense of their rights. Lenin had previously declared that these national liberation movements would probably mean civil war within the capitalist countries and their colonies.

When a few of the many Russian minorities took their alleged right of self-determination seriously, the Red Army quickly corrected their error. Inside Soviet Russia, there can only be "unity of will." By 1928, this meant unity of Stalin's will. But in the colonies of the British Empire

and in the southern part of the United States, Negro minorities must exert every effort to set up separate Negro Soviet Republics.

Few people in this country know that Stalin had decreed a Negro Soviet Republic for the South back in 1928. Nevertheless, a perusal of the official Party literature will show that possibly half of what Communists have written about Negroes in this country has dealt with the slogan of self-determination in the Black Belt. On the one hand, the communist leaders knew that they could not get Negroes to become shock brigades for a civil war in this country. On the other hand, Stalin had commanded a program of self-determination in the Black Belt. This left only one means of evasion open to the Party leaders. They could conduct interminable theoretical debates and write thousands of pages of discussion articles, which ended just about where they began.

These deliberations on the precise meaning of the distinct "nation-hood" of Negroes in this country were, and still are, something out of this world. Their basic point of departure was always, of course, Stalin's own definition of a nation. According to Stalin, every nation must have a common territory, a common language, a common economic system, a common historical background and a common cultural and psychological make-up. Finding

the common territory of the Negro nation proved relatively easy, since the Black Belt consists of those adjoining counties in Southern States in which Negroes are alleged to be the majority of the total population. On the other hand, the matter of common language and common economic system offered serious difficulties. To the un-Marxist eye, they appeared to be identical with those of Southern whites. The communist experts, however, rose to the perplexing situation with reams and reams of obscure "correct Leninist orientation."

Great efforts were also made to show how Negroes look upon Africa as their "old country" and how they still cherish many of the customs which their ancestors practised there. The fact is that no other minority group in this land ever had fewer ties with the "old country." The only culture and history which Negroes can remember is what they learned from white people in the colonies. It was the express policy of the white colonists to destroy as far as possible all tribal connections and memories among Negroes, since nearly all the slave revolts in pre-Civil War days were started by members of the same tribe. However, if Negroes did not seem to have a distinct historical background, communist experts would obligingly invent one for them. Stalin must always be pleased.

The toughest nut of all to crack

195

nin

19

lor

Ur

Co

Co

tio

Er

th

ar

in

U

85

was the problem of common culture and common psychological makeup. If it is contended that Negroes are a nation, then they ought to have distinct cultural interests-distinct, that is, from the rest of Americans. About the only distinctive features of Negro culture which the communist experts were able to dig up were the Negro spirituals. But these could hardly justify the claim of a separate Negro culture. It took the communist experts from 1928 to 1946 to solve this problem, which they did in a very peculiar way. According to the "correct Stalinist orientation," Negroes are a young nation, not really aware of the fact. William Z. Foster, chairman of the Party, even admitted that, whenever the subject is brought up, Negroes get very angry. Nonetheless, they must be a nation on at least the "unconscious level," since Stalin said that they are a nation. The problem before the communist experts is how to persuade Negroes to elevate their "unconscious" sense of nationhood into something that can be used to provoke riots and civil war in this country. Perhaps Freud could help the communist experts. Unfortunately, Freud's philosophy does not appeal to Communists.

From 1928 to 1933, the Comintern compelled the communist leaders in this country to push the slogan of self-determination in the Black Belt. But in the latter year, directives from Moscow commanded them to soft-

pedal it, since it might irritate Southern congressmen too much. At that time, Stalin needed votes for recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States. After 1935, the slogan of self-determination received a further set-back as not being in harmony with the cooperative spirit of the Anti-Fascist Democratic Front (1935-1939). And besides, Southern congressmen might even be cajoled into voting aid to the Soviet Union.

BROWDER MAKES STATEMENT

During the war, communist tactics swung so far to the right that in January, 1944 Earl Browder came out with an article which he later regretted very much. In this article, Browder declared that Negroes had already exercised their right of selfdetermination, and that what they had determined upon was complete integration into American life. Nearly every student of social trends in this country could have told him this, years earlier. But in January, 1944, Browder and all the leading Communists, except Foster, felt very happy at having laid the problem of self-determination to rest in a way "which no foreseeable development could now change."

Naturally, Browder could not see ahead clearly to April, 1945, when Jacques Duclos, leader of the Communist Party of France, was to issue a letter condemning most of what Browder had done since the beginning of the war. By the middle of 1945, Russia was safe again, and no longer needed the assistance of the United States and Great Britain. Consequently, Stalin could order all Communists to push self-determination in the colonies of the British Empire and in the southern part of the United States. With Germany and Japan out of the way, civil wars in the British Empire and in the United States would become great assets to the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, in July, 1945, the Communist leaders had to reopen the entire question of self-determination in the Black Belt. Knowing how much Negroes hate the idea as destructive of everything they hope for, the Party experts conduct "learned" discussions and debates on the slogan, but try as much as possible to keep from letting Negroes know about them. It is doubtful whether one Negro in a hundred so much as hears that these discussions are going on. Doxey Wilkerson, the "expert" Negro defense witness whom the communist leaders kept on the stand for eleven days straight, during the New York trial, wrote an article in the July, 1946, issue of Political Affairs (the highest theoretical publication of the Party), in which he listed no fewer than eight reasons why this business of self-determniation should not be revived. However, he ended by submitting to Party discipline.

Francis Franklin, a Southern white who was expelled from the Party last year, has accurately summed up the attitude of Negroes toward the right of self-determination. According to his discussion article in Political Affairs for May, 1946, the only effect which this slogan ever had upon Negroes was to confuse them and to give them the impression that Communists were more than a little queer. He added that whenever Negroes figured out exactly what it meant, they became very angry and would have nothing to do with it.

Nevertheless, the Communist Party still officially promotes this slogan of self-determination in the Black Belt and will continue to do so as long as Stalin orders it. To a reader unfamiliar with the labyrinths of communist ideology, this twenty-one year ema phasis upon so unpopular a slogan may seem weird and almost unbelievable. But at least it brings out one fact very clearly: communist propaganda in this country is a very foreign affair. If Stalin wants Negroes to sacrifice their future in this country through a civil war against white people, the Party leaders certainly will not gainsay him. Happily, Jackie Robinson told the entire American nation something it should already have known as certain: although discriminated against and often seriously mistreated, Negroes will nevertheless fight for Uncle Sam, and not for Uncle Ice.

Saint Paul, A Spiritual Master

AUGUSTINE KLAAS, S.J. Professor of Theology, St. Mary's College, Kansas

Reprinted from the REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS*

TN TARSUS, a bustling seaport of Cilicia in Asia Minor and "no mean city," the future Apostle of the Gentiles was born of Jewish parents in moderate circumstances sometime in the first decade of our era. His father, of the tribe of Benjamin, but also a Roman citizen, gave him at his circumcision the Jewish name of Saul and brought him up in the strict educational tradition of the Pharisees. In this cosmopolitan town, cut in two by the Cydnus River and overshadowed by the Taurus Mountains. young Saul, besides his Hebrew Scriptures, learned Aramaic, Greek. probably Latin, and incidentally picked up the useful trade of weaving tent cloth. Still a youth he went off to the rabbinical school at Jerusalem to study the Jewish Law under the famous doctor, Gamaliel. Studies completed, he returned to Tarsus, but later came back to Palestine in time to assist, perhaps not without guilt, at the stoning of Stephen the first Christian martyr. Of an ardent, dynamic temperament, he became in the ensuing persecution a zealot for the Jewish Law and took to hunting down for arrest members of the new religion founded by Jesus Christ until one day at high noon, on the road to Damascus, in a blaze of light Saul met his risen Lord. His eyes were blinded, but he never saw more clearly in his life. From Saul, the persecuting Pharisee infatuated with the Old Law, he suddenly became Paul, the apostle of Jesus Christ, destined to carry the New Law almost to the ends of the then-known world.

195

of

the

Ma

sic

th

ag hir

tre

ho

an

tir

ce

is

lip

m

0

lo

a

ir

e

te

ti

n

I

9

Baptized in Damascus by Ananias and his sight restored, Paul retired for a considerable time to the Arabian desert south of that city to prepare himself for the apostolate by reflection, penance and prayer. He emerged to begin his missionary labors, first at Damascus, then at Jerusalem, then at Tarsus, finally establishing with Barnabas a base at Antioch, third largest city of the Roman Empire and the "gateway to the East," where his special apostolate to the Gentiles began to take definite shape. It was here that the baptized were first called Christians, though Paul never employs that term. He prefers to call baptized Christians saints, sanctified, well-beloved of God, faithful, chosen ones, holy and loyal brethren.

From Antioch, beginning about 45 A.D., Paul made three extensive missionary journeys. He won over large multitudes of converts to the true Faith. With Barnabas, Silas and Timothy he founded and organized Christian churches up and down the

re

he

ne

8-

st

d.

98

d

ie

to

y le a-

n

le

0

te ps, n. is of d whole of Asia Minor, in the islands of the Mediterranean, and, over on the mainland of Europe, in Greece, Macedonia and Italy.

THREE APOSTOLIC BATTLES

During some twenty intensive missionary years Paul fought to victory three important apostolic battles: one against the Jews, who never forgave him for deserting them and who treated him as a traitor and apostate, hounding him during his whole life and once almost succeeding in putting him to death; another against certain Christian converts from Judaism who wanted to retain in the religion of the New Testament too many customs and practices of the Old Law now defunct; the third, the longest and hardest battle of all, against the pagan Gentiles and the influence of paganism on the recent converts to Christianity.

Paul with magnificent generosity toiled and suffered in both body and soul to accomplish these three objectives. He went through an incredible number of adventures and experienced all the so-called romance of the missions, as when he escaped over the wall of Damascus in a basket, or stood on Paphos before the Roman governor Sergius Paulus to confound the magician Elymas, or was mistaken for the pagan god Mercury at Lystra, or preached of the "unkown god" in the Areopagus at Athens, or clashed with the pagan silversmiths in Ephesus. Signs and prodigies accompanied him everywhere. To sum up his life he can say forthrightly and without vanity:

I have toiled harder, spent longer days in prison, been beaten so cruelly, so often looked death in the face. Five times the Jews scourged me and spared me but one lash in the forty; three times I was beaten with rods, once I was stoned; I have been shipwrecked three times, I have spent a night and a day as a castaway at sea. What journeys I have undertaken, in danger from rivers, in danger from robbers, in danger from my own people, in danger from the Gentiles; danger in the cities, danger in the wilderness, danger in the sea, danger among false brethren! I have met with toil and weariness, so often been sleepless, hungry and thirsty; so often denied myself food. gone cold and naked. And all this, over and above something else which I do not count; I mean the burden I carry every day, my anxious care for all the churches. Does anyone feel a scruple? I share it. Is anyone's conscience hurt? I am ablaze with indignation. If I must needs boast, I will boast of the things which humiliate me; the God who is Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, blessed be his name for ever, knows that I am telling the truth. (II Cor. 11: 23-31.)

Such was the apostolic career of Paul, God's "vessel of election," the indomitable warrior for Christ unto the Gentiles.

In the year 60 Paul was in prison at Caesarea where he remained confined, but not too closely, for two years, until he "appealed to Caesar." He demanded as a Roman citizen to be sent to the capital for trial. His right was recognized and his petition granted. Two more years passed, this time in close imprisonment in Rome; then, at last, trial and acquital. Im-

19

kn

re

sec

for

be

pe

itu

In

ar

Ĭŧ

P

Ve

ir

18

ti

aCb

C

mediately Paul was off to Spain and then back again to the East, but his time was fast running out. Once more apprehended in Rome and brought to trial he was condemned to death by decapitation and summarily executed on the Ostian Way under Nero, most probably in the year 67.

Taking for granted God's ordinary and extraordinary graces, likewise the numerous miracles that accompanied his missionary labors, what was the human character and personality that made Paul the Church's most successful apostle of all times? Physically it seems that Paul was not very prepossessing; he was small of stature and afflicted with some sort of chronic illness. Yet he had all the fire, energy and dynamism of a heroic man of action; he had a mind rich in ideas, that could think for itself, that was sharp in controversial debate; he had a gift of eloquence in speech; he had sound judgment and an uncanny foresight in choosing the strategic sites of new churches; he was an excellent judge of men to put in charge of them. He was a splendid organizer, pliant and adaptable both in speech and action; he could meet any emergency; he could be and was "all things to all men." Cardinal Newman lists "human sympathy" as Paul's outstanding quality of character. He was also utterly selfless and completely devoted to the cause of Christ. Of course, there were some faults, too, in this strong character: he was at times impatient, self-willed, and not an altogether easy man to work with, as Peter, Barnabas and Luke found out to their dismay.

If Paul was eminently the man of apostolic action, he was also the contemplative. He had the simple, profound refined traits of the contemplative and was actually gifted with the highest mystical graces (II Cor. 12: 2-7). Moreover, he harmonized perfectly the active life and the contemplative life, as every real apostle must earnestly strive to do.

SPIRITUAL WISDOM

The Acts of the Apostles, written by Paul's disciple and companion Luke, gives a vivid account of Paul's external missionary activity; his interior life and his doctrine, dogmatic. moral and spiritual, are contained chiefly in his fourteen immortal letters. In this article we are interested above all in setting forth the essential points of Paul's spiritual doctrine which form likewise, as might be expected, the sum and substance of his own personal spiritual life. Scattered as fragments throughout his Epistles, they are here brought together in a synthesis that reveals something at least of the compelling power and beauty of Paul's spiritual wisdom.

The fundamental doctrine of Saint Paul's spiritual teaching is the close union of Christians with Christ and Christ with Christians. Christians are with Christ, they are in Christ, in some way they are Christ. Whoever does harm to Christians does harm to Christ; whoever divides Christians into factions, divides Christ. When Paul was struck down in his mad career of persecuting Christians, he heard a voice: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" Paul wanted to

Dy

of

n-

0-

8-

he

2:

r-

n-

est

en

on

l's

n-

ic.

ed

et-

ed

al

ne

X-

is

ed

25,

8

at

nd

int

se

nd

re

in

er

rm

ns

en

ad

he

er-

to

know who was speaking. The voice replied: I am Jesus Whom thou persecutest" (Acts 9:3-5). Paul never forgot it. That Christians are Christ became the basic principle of his own personal spirituality and of his spiritual message to the first Christians. Indeed, this principle epitomizes the whole divine plan of man's salvation and perfection for time and eternity. It pulsates throughout his Epistles.

To explain more clearly the intimate union of Christ with Christians, Paul employs many analogies, some very striking. Christians are the living stones of a house of which Christ is the cornerstone. Christians are living shoots grafted onto Christ. Christians are united to Christ as closely as husband and wife in marriage. Christians and Christ form a living body of which Christ is the Head. Of course, these images fall far short of the sublime spiritual reality they are meant to describe and explain, namely, that a member of the true Church of Christ is by that very fact a member of Christ's Body. Christ and Christians are one.

The union is such that Christ shares His life with Christians. Christ actually lives in Christians. Hence, Christians live by a new life—Christ's life, the supernatural life of grace. Christ's life flows in Christians as sap flows from the tree trunk through its branches, as blood courses from the heart to the extremities of the body. It is much more than the Eucharistic presence; it is the life of grace, a real if analogous sharing by Christians in the divine life of Christ.

There is here no pantheism, no

identity of life. The Christian always retains his own individual personality. Nor is this vital union an essential one, such as the substantial union of soul and body. Neither is it a personal union, as the union of the human nature with the divine Person of Christ. Yet, if it is less than a physical union, it is more than a mere moral union. It is a hidden, secret, mysterious union, supernatural but none the less also very real. It is a mystical union of Christ the Head with the members of His Mystical Body. Paul declares: "And I live. now not I; but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20). "For to me, to live is Christ." (Phil. 1:21). Just as for Paul, Christ lives in Christians, and they live in Christ, with Christ, for Christ; they are incorporated into Christ. In a word, the life of Christians is Christ.

LIFE IN CHRIST

By reason of this incorporation into Christ Christians enter into the life of the Blessed Trinity. The Christ-life in their souls makes them, like Christ, sons of God. Christ is the first-born and only Son of the Father by nature; we Christians are sons by grace, the grace of adoption. Adopted sonship is something real. though analogous and subordinate to Christ's sonship. By reason of it, Christ becomes our elder brother and with Christ we become joint heirs of the Father. Moreover, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, dwells as in a temple in those incorporated by grace into Christ, forming Christ in them. making them more and more per-

ha

SW.

pe

CI

fectly images of Christ. The Holy Spirit is also the principle of life and unity in the Mystical Body, uniting the members with the Head, and the members with each other. Hence, all Christians are brothers, fundamentally equal, intimately bound to one another, indeed, members of each other in Christ. Children of the same Father, vitalized by the same Holy Spirit, they form a solidarity with Christ and with each other, a sublime solidarity that transcends both space and time.

The gift of faith being presupposed in adults, how is this life in Christ, this incorporation into His Mystical Body, this entry into the life of the Blessed Trinity initiated? By baptism. Baptism, through the merits of Christ, washes away sin, original and actual, by infusing into the soul justifying grace, the grace of spiritual regeneration, a new life, supernatural life, a free gift of God. In baptism the believer participates in the death and burial of Christ through immersion; he dies to sin and to the "old man" in him. But he also shares in the resurrection of Christ when he emerges from the saving baptismal waters to the life of Christ's grace, to the life of the "new man." He is now liberated from the powers of darkness and, signed by the Holy Spirit of Christ, becomes a member of Christ's Kingdom, the Church.

The life of the Christian is therefore a dying and a living with Christ, a dying to sin in order to live the Christ-life of virtue and live it to the full. Having become a member of Christ by faith and baptism he must

now strip himself ever more and more of everything that is not Christ, and also seek to put on Christ more and more, progressively to identify himself, as it were, with Christ, that Christ may gradually take fuller possession of his whole soul, live in it, become its whole life. In short, life in Christ is not static; it is eminently dynamic. Justification must be followed up by sanctification, of which it is only the beginning. And sanctification must grow until it ends in everlasting glory.

PERSONAL SANCTIFICATION

How then is this life in Christ to be lived and increased? How is sanctification accomplished? By progressively putting off the "old man" and putting on the "new man," by ceasing to live the life of the "flesh" to live ever more and more the life of the "spirit," by continually dying and being buried with Christ crucified in order to live more abundantly with the resurrected Christ, in a word, by an ever greater avoidance of evil and imperfection and a more enthusiastic pursuit of supernatural good.

To do this effectively involves a struggle, an all-out spiritual combat, a courageous battle against the world, the flesh and the devil. The Christian must be like a soldier fighting with a full panoply of virtue, or like an athlete engaged in a crucial boxing match in the arena, who does not beat the air uselessly but delivers telling blows on his opponent. Especially, like the runner in the stadium, the Christian must turn away from all else and concentrate mind and muscle

May

and

rist,

ore

tify

hat

it,

life

ntly

fol-

rich

cti-

in

t to

inc-

res-

and

889

to

of

and

l in

vith

by

and

stic

8 8

bat.

rld.

tian

vith

an

eat

lly,

the

all

scle

on his objective: he must deny himself, suffer many a privation and hardship, ever maintain a salutary fear of failure, steadily increase the swiftness of his pursuit of Christ, and persevere to victory. Constant, energetic effort must be exerted if the crowning goal of spiritual perfection is ever to be attained.

CONFIDENCE IN GOD

Of course, God always stands by with His help and His grace, without which nothing is possible supernaturally, but the Christian himself must co-operate, must fight on bravely, relentlessly, confidently. There must be no discouragement, no defeatism; rather an unfailing buoyant optimism that ultimately the battle will be gained, the enemy vanquished and the race won. Thus, no matter what may be his station in life, even though it be that of a slave, he will achieve the dignity and destiny of a true Christian, possessing faith, liberty, charity, peace, hope, joy, thanksgiving, apostolic zeal, loving and serving his fellow men for the love of God. Thus, too, will the love and freedom of the New Law triumph over the fear and servitude of the Old, for the New Law is not the mere meticulous observance of multitudinous commands. but above all it is a living, a living of life in Christ.

The assiduous practice of penance and mortification implied in the spiritual combat is predominantly a negative aspect of Christian living and perfection. The more positive way is the progressive putting on of Christ and His manifold moral virtues, so

that gradually Jesus Christ takes undisputed possession of the whole soul, lives in it, becomes its very life.

To accomplish this, the Christian must be assimilated to Christ; he must take on the moral and spiritual likeness of Christ through imitation. He must imitate not so much the particular physical actions of Christ, but must above all assimilate the thoughts and sentiments, the "mind" of Christ. Therefore, not merely an external but an internal, not so much an outward as an inward, resemblance must be sought and striven for. He must put on Christ's interior, His spirit, His "mind." And this means the mind of Christ as the Word of God before the Incarnation, principally as the Godman in the mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption, in His crucifixion, death and burial, but also in His Resurrection and Ascension, and finally as the Head of the Mystical Body now gloriously reigning in heaven.

Jesus Christ is indeed the Grand Model, the exalted exemplary cause of all spiritual perfection; and it is the Holy Spirit residing within us who by His inspirations and guidance gives individuality to our imitation of Christ. Indeed, Christ Himself also co-operates directly in our assimilation to Him; hence we must ask for His help in persevering prayer.

Assimilation to Christ by imitation already leads to and even effects a certain union with Christ, union of mind and affections. Beyond this, the Christian must also zealously strive for union of will with Christ by charity, prayer and action, all of which

should increase his union day by day. Here is where the Holy Eucharist plays a leading role in the spiritual life, since the Eucharistic Sacrifice and banquet brings Christians into intimate union with Christ. The chalice of benediction is a partaking of Christ's blood; the bread broken is a sharing of Christ's body. The Holy Eucharist therefore is a bond of union between Christians and Christ in His sacrificial death and in His living presence.

Union with Christ as Head of the Mystical Body will also progress in depth and in extension in proportion as we advance in union with Christ by intellect, will and action. And this ever closer union with Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, brings with it an ever closer union with the other members of the Mystical Christ, just as by sharing in the common food of Christ's Body Christians become one body. The Holy Eucharist is a real bond of union between Christians themselves because they are "one bread." This Eucharistic bond also marvellously preserves, cements perfects that other union (through baptism) of the faithful with each other as members of the Mystical Body of Christ.

In addition to this, to a fortunate few, of whose number Paul was one, there is granted in this life as a divine gift an extraordinary, mystical, ecstatic vision of and union with God. The qualities and effects of this union for the Church and the individual are somewhat obscurely related by St. Paul in his Epistles. We are not here directly concerned with this ineffable

experience nor with the other charismatic gifts of grace mentioned by St. Paul, who considers them the special workings of the Holy Spirit.

And so, as the years advance, life in Christ must develop and progress. It is dynamic, not static; an increasing, not a mere preserving; an augmenting of grace, not merely a repelling of sin; a going forward, not a standing still; a growth, vital, organic, gradual, from infancy and childhood to maturity, from weakness unto strength. The Body of Christ must grow to perfect manhood. to the fulness of Christ. Individual spiritual growth there must be, but this is at the same time growth of the Mystical Body; and the necessary condition of its increase is growth in union with the Head of the Mystical Body. This upbuilding of the Body of Christ is not only intensive, but also extensive, adding new members to the Body of Christ, in order to supply what is still lacking to the fulness, the completeness, the pleroma of the Mystical Christ.

LIFE OF GLORY

While the Christian is thus growing in his own personal Christ-life and also augmenting qualitatively and quantitatively the living Body of Christ, he is on his way to the life of glory, which is pledged to him both by the Spirit of Christ dwelling within him because he is a child of God, a joint heir with Christ, and by the thrilling fact that God loves him and wants to share His glory with him. By baptism, it is true, he died with the dying Christ; but Christ is

May

ris.

St.

cial

life

ess.

as-

ug-

re-

not

-10

ind

ak-

of

od.

ual

out

he

TY

in

cal

dy

ut

ers

ıp-

58,

he

w-

fe

ly

of

of

th

ıg

οf

m

th

d

is

also a risen Christ, and so he must rise with Christ-mystically in baptism, morally and ascetically during his whole life-in order that he may share in His glorious resurrection. By baptism he was made a member of the risen Christ. He must realize more and more Christ's resurrection by his fervent Christian life, until he is transformed from glory to glory unto the image of the risen Savior. This spiritual, mystical resurrection, which belongs to him by baptism, is his in its plenitude only after death, since the spiritual resurrection of the soul is completed after death by the resurrection of his transformed body. Death, no longer a punishment for sin, is really an ascension and entrance into glory.

Only then will the grand plan of God regarding this world be fully revealed. Only then shall we understand the mystery of Christ, namely, that the Mystical Christ is the true purpose of creation. Christ is the Head of all; He is over all, and all serve Him. Christ came into this world to unite all creation under His sway and to draw all creation after Him, for He ascends again on high. He has lowered Himself to this earth only to draw to Himself and to restore all to God; all belongs to Christ and Christ belongs to God. With a magnificent sweeping gesture Christ summons all the members of His Mystical Body and takes them with Him to the place prepared for them in the Blessed Trinity.

The Blessed Trinity was active in our incorporation into Christ by baptism and in our whole life in Christ; now each person of the Blessed Trinity has a share also in our glorification with Christ. Drawn by the Father, who sees us more and more conformed to His beloved Son and who continues to transform us from glory to glory into the image of His Son; sustained interiorly by the Holy Spirit, who signs us with His seal, implants in us the pledges of immortality, and gives us the first fruits and guaranty of glory: raised from the dead and borne aloft by the risen Christ because of the true oneness that binds all the members to the Mystical Head, we shall share in the very life of the Blessed Trinity. Then in due time will come the great parousia, the manifestation of the glory of the children of God at the second coming of Christ. This parousia will be the glorification, the apotheosis of the Mystical Christ, who with all the members joined to the Head has now reached His full and lasting maturity. Finally, the glorious Mystical Christ with all His glorified members will be taken up to eternal rest in the bosom of God.

SUMMARY

To summarize Paul's spiritual doctrine briefly. The life of Christians in Christ is a sublime reality, inaugurated by baptism, which is a participation in Christ's death and resurrection. This life in Christ, this incorporation into the Church, His Mystical Body, must increase and grow steadily as long as we live on earth. It grows by our putting off the "old man" and putting on the "new man," by our sharing ever more and more

in Christ's death and resurrection, by an ever greater assimilation to Christ by imitation and an ever closer union with Him and His mystical members by faith, charity and virtuous action, especially by partaking of the Holy Eucharist.

Thus, by developing our own personal interior life in Christ under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and at the same time by augmenting both qualitatively and quantitatively the Mystical Body of Christ, we prepare

for and indeed already begin our glorification with the risen Christ in heaven. This glorification will reach its climax when we participate in the second coming of Christ and then, as members of the Mystical Christ, are assumed with Him into the eternal sanctuary of the Triune God. The pleroma has now been attained. God's family is finally complete; His eternal, unchanging plan, accomplished. God is now "all in all" forever. (I Cor. 15:22-28.)

Not Pie in the Sky

"Now the accusation brought by the enemies of Christ against His servants from the first day, from the time when they were denounced by their first persecutors as the enemies of the human race, has always been that they refuse to be of this world, that they turn away from it in favor of a projection of their own agony and terror which they call God. You know how often they are reproached for this estrangement. But it is also said that the more subtle among us (this is the Marxist accusation) only encourage the poor and the unhappy to turn their eyes to heaven in order to establish themselves more securely in peaceful occupation of their possessions. It is only too true that there are Catholics of a certain school who have done all they can to bring people to believe it. But we at least should know that detachment, that the denial which is imposed on us in order to counteract in our personal lives all its covetousness, does but serve to make us free to devote ourselves personally to our brethren. This is what is meant by corresponding with grace, and why Saint John of the Cross said that it is by love we shall be judged on the last day."-Francois Mauriac in THE COMMONWEAL, Feb. 3, 1950.

The Kingdom by the Sea

GEORGE H. WELDON

Reprinted from the DENVER CATHOLIC REGISTER*

ONCE upon a time, in a beautiful kingdom by the sea, there lived a man named Americus Secularizer, who suffered the twofold ill of being conscientious and logical to an insane degree. One day Mr. Secularizer heard a thin, sharp-faced man in a long black coat mutter that "we must rear a strong wall of separation between Church and State." And with this Mr. Secularizer concurred.

Leaving mother and father and wife and children, he mounted his fiery white charger and dashed hither and you through the countryside of the beautiful kingdom by the sea spreading his faith in this mighty doctrine.

He aroused public opinion to such an extent that the Cabinet of the President of the nation was enlarged to include a Secretary for the Separation of Church and State. Mr. Secularizer, of course, was appointed to the office, with full power to stamp out union of Church and State wherever and whenever the hideous monster might rear one of its several ugly heads.

But it was on the day he was to take office that Mr. Secularizer

came a cropper.

When he stepped up to take his oath of office he was told to place his hand upon the Bible and "swear before..." But no! Mr. Secularizer felt that this would be union of Church and State, and so he abolished the custom forthwith and said that he would swear on the Declaration of Independence. But he saw that that document speaks of "nature's God," and of all men being "created equal." But these doctrines also smack of union of Church and State and must, therefore, be abolished.

Mr. Secularizer by this time was in a bit of a dither. He reached in his pocket and drew out a coin and said he would swear by the image of liberty. Just as he cleared his throat, preparatory to taking the oath, he saw the tiny inscription, "In God We Trust." He threw the coin from him in a rage and astounded the economists by declaring that his first official act would be to abolish the entire monetary system in favor of one that would not offend the most irreligious person in the kingdom.

Finally, as newsmen waited, Mr. Secularizer perused the Constitution of the kingdom by the sea and found nothing to indicate union of Church and State, and so he placed his hand confidently on that revered doctrine and began to recite the oath of office. Right in the middle of his recitation he turned pale, winced, faltered, and stopped—an oath is a promise made before God, he realized, and therefore he could not in conscience take an oath to uphold a political office, for that certainly would be rocking the very foundations of the strong wall of separation which must exist between Church and State.

Then a flood of realizations assailed his mind all at once. He saw that he, a Christian, could not be both a Christian and a government official because he would interpret government business in the light of his Christian principles. That would be union of Church and State of the most damnable kind. His logical mind carried him still farther afield, for he realized that by the same reasoning he could not even be a Christian and a citizen at the same time, because that, too, would be union of Church and State. Suddenly he blanched. Another idea was knocking for recognition, but he could not face it; he closed his mind.

Mr. Secularizer—remember, he was conscientious as 'well as logical—interrupted the ceremony and said: "I must have time to think." He walked slowly to the tower of the capitol buliding of the kingdom by the sea and sat down to mull over his problem. The crowd went home, and the newsmen wandered off in search of a murder.

Hours later, citizens of the kingdom by the sea were startled when their favorite give-away programs were interrupted to bring them a special bulletin announcing that the newly appointed Secretary for the Separation of Church and State had committed suicide.

The next morning the janitors found, high in the tower of the capitol building, a hastily scrawled note, which said:

"Since man is composed of a body and soul which interact on each other, I have become convinced that it is impossible to achieve absolute separation of Church and State without separating body from soul.

"I have pledged my word; the nation is depending upon me. I cannot turn back. Therefore, I consummate, as far as is in my power, the separation of Church and State. I separate my body, which the state recognizes, from my soul, which is an excrescence on the body politic."

Catholics and Liberals

THE Catholic members of the 80th Congress, according to the voting standards set up by the New Republic, were roughly twice as "liberal" as the Senate and House taken as a whole. That is how the 1949 record reads after the New Republic's annual tabulation of liberal batting averages. A year ago Dale Francis, Notre Dame professor, did a painstaking analysis of the 79th Congress for this magazine and found that of the 14 key issues chosen by the New Republic then, Congress as a whole voted 34 per cent of the time in the liberal direction: on the same 14 issues Catholics in the House voted liberal 71 per cent of the time. The record in the Senate. Francis found. was just about the same: Senate at large, 33 per cent; Catholic Senators, 71 per cent.

At first blush it would seem that Catholics must be a pretty "liberal" lot. Certainly they are, on the level of Congressional performance, even according to the standards set by the New Republic. The large number of Catholics consistently on the honor roll, however, doesn't seem to have calmed down any of the liberals' fears. There is just as much suspi-

cion of Catholic reaction in the butcher-paper press as there ever was; just as many insinuations and outright charges, maybe more. It is not that the New Republic and its fellow liberals have lost confidence in their own day-to-day political standards, but that the indefinite thing in America called liberalism is, in the last anaylsis, something more than just

a political movement.

American "Liberalism" is a kind of religion; better, a substitute for religion. It involves certain attitudes and unspoken dogmas about man himself, the nature and end of society, the moral law and the final end of human activity. On many of these questions, and on the corollaries that follow from them, Catholics, just because they are Catholics, are found in opposition. Euthanasia, birthprevention, divorce and personal moral responsibility are a few key questions. Each of these has been hotly discussed in the liberal press during the past year. Each of them, to Catholics, involves issues distinctly religious. It is on religious grounds that Catholics take the stands they take. Still it is rarely on religious or philosophical grounds that the liberals argue. More often, the opposing views on questions of this kind are lined up as the "liberal" view versus the "reactionary" view. What should be moral, religious and philosophical arguments are carried on according to arbitrary political designations. A politician who votes against a birth-control law is, at least as far as that act goes, "reactionary," a contrary vote is registered as "liberal." By these standards, the Catholic is, and will continue to be, hopelessly reactionary. Unless, of course, he ceases to be a Catholic. And that, sometimes, is what it seems he is being asked to do.

We have never seen an outright invitation to apostasy in the liberal press. But when you criticize a man for his religious allegiance, his religious belief and practice, you are in effect inviting him to change his religion. Even that, Catholics could take without too much rancor if it were not accompanied by pious declamations that "we have nothing against your religion as such." Certainly there are Catholics who mix up their religion with politics. But they are not the only ones. There are also plenty of liberals who mix up their politics with religion. Behind the strictly political label, there is very often an issue fundamentally theological.

"Liberal" and "reactionary" Catholics alike are quite willing to defend their theology. But when the opposition puts its arguments solely in political terms, the difficulties block-

ing understanding are immense. Then you have the present unhappy situation: American Catholics and American liberals virtually without a means for communication. And because this is true, the nation itself suffers.—The Commonweal, February 3, 1950.

CCS Ten Years Old

T WAS in 1939 when the Catholic Committee of the South was organized. One of its purposes was to meet a challenge made by President Roosevelt, "that the South was the economic problem Number One of our country."

Two Richmonders, Father Thomas E. O'Connell and Paul D. Williams, were among a group of Southern Catholic leaders who recognized that the Church had much to offer in such fields as industry, rural life, racial relations and community services.

Father Vincent J. O'Connell, S. M., of New Orleans, now general chairman, summarizes a detailed account of the Committee's accomplishments as follows:

It is felt that during the first ten years of its existence the Catholic Committee of the South has proved its worth. It has been an instrument of friendly cooperation among the various Southern Dioceses. Catholic leaders have been discovered and encouraged. Non-Catholic and non-sectarian regional organizations seek its advice and collaboration. The Church is recognized by Christian and democratic

leaders as a co-worker in the challenging task of making the Southland the theatre for the noblest, finest experiment in democratic life that the world has ever seen.

With a full-time executive secretary, Phillip Ogilvie, in office this year for the first time, the CCS should have a still greater opportunity to be of service to the South during the next decade.—The Catholic Virginian, Richmond, Va., Oct. 28, 1949.

Death—and Design for Living

IT has become a tacit assumption of the modern world that death is the end, so far as the human being's personal existence is concerned. The notion that it is the gate of a new life, to which this planetary one is only a prelude, is very commonly considered as too ill-founded to be made the firm basis of a "design for living" by intelligent realists in this age of science. All the typical "present-day" conceptions of the "good life," all the currently accepted aims of "planners" for the well-being of the community and the peace of the world, take it for granted that "the pursuit of happiness" must find fulfillment here on earth or not at all: that earthly failure, or tragedy or misery is an ultimate, irremediable disaster. It is, indeed, a common attitude that the people whom Nietzsche called "Backworldsmen," who look beyond the world for the truest life, the highest beauty, are not merely "wishful thinkers" but in some sense cowardly "quitters," who have abandoned the quest for satisfaction and meaning and beauty in Nature in favor of ancestral illusions. The truly brave—we are told—are those who embrace this brief life as worthwhile for what it is, and face "the big dark" with a resolution unbuoyed by any false hopes. . . . "When the Angel with his darker

"When the Angel with his darker draught

Draws near to thee—take that, and

do not shrink."

Similarly, the truly "realistic" statesmanship is one in which there is no over-valuing of the "brief candle" of the individual's personal life—in which that life is seen as a moment in the larger process of the collective life, important only in so far as it contributes to "social well-being."

It is easy enough to criticize the thought which ties man down to the prison-house of time and space, and proclaims dogmatically that his "immortal longings" through the ages should be ignored as pathological social symptoms or infantile dreams. It can be shown that there are solid rational grounds for the view that the life-principle in man which makes him a "person" is not subject to the law of decay and death in nature, which governs the physical process which we call the human body. We can point out that it is

19

as

is

pr

ca

CI

ch

ea

th

not we, but our opponents, who are irrational-since they allow their thought to be dominated by senseimpressions which they refuse to examine critically: that they, too, are frequently guilty of "wishful thinking" in their attitude to the otherworld and the after-life-the "wishful thinking" of men who cannot endure the idea of being bound by a law of no human making, and subject to a destiny not determined by human wills. Behind the passionate resolve not to accept any life but this, in a world where man's power and will overshadows all visible things, there is a secret detestation of the thought that they may not, after all, be masters of their fate and captains of their souls, but subject to the judgment and the purposes of a higher Power. Even heaven itself seems unendurable to many a "modern mind" if it is a heaven built by God for His servants, glorified by obedience, instead of one achieved by the creative effort and science of man lifting himself to superhuman greatness and splendor as the spearhead of the life-force.

DANGER OF UNBELIEF

We can show, too, how the acceptance of man's total mortality leads inevitably to the atrocities of "totalitarian" tyranny, in which the logic of the view that the collective life alone has meaning and permanent value is applied by the complete

subjugation of individual freedom to the "planners" and the "liquidation" or reduction to subhuman servitude of those who are regarded as socially useless or deleterious.

Finally, we can point out that the man who refuses firmly to entertain the hope of immortality, and fails even to pay serious attention to the evidences for the Christian belief in this matter, is no more brave and realistic than a man who refuses to open the door of his dark room and come out into the sunshine. Is it not sanity at least to examine the grounds of "sure and certain hope" entertained by many of the wisest as well as best of our race, before wrapping the Stoic's mantle around one's head, and turning it grimly to the wall?

But while criticism of the superficial materialism and despair of our world is not very difficult, it is terribly easy for the Christian-even the Catholic-to fall into the atmosphere of thought of that world, so far as his normal habit of mind is concerned. To what extent are we aware. in our daily lives, of the truth of Immortal Life and all that it implies? To what extent does our attitude to death-the death of the body-differ from that of our pagan, or half-pagan fellow-men? For them, it is "morbid" and depressing to think too much of their own deaths, and mere useless grieving to ponder over those of their lost friends and dear ones. to

le

ly

ne

ls

ne in

d

0

m

e

15

e

r

ľ

D

The decent conventions of mourning are, of course, observed—as briefly as possible, when the dead friend is consigned to the tomb. Words of praise are uttered, where anything can be found to praise: blame and criticism are silenced, or muted by charity. The flowers are laid on the earth where he lies "asleep"—and that is all. "Life must go on": and he belongs to life no more.

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE

How different it is-or ought to be-with ourselves! For we know that there is no such thing as the total loss of human personal life: that the soul of the man we bury has already passed for judgment into the Divine Presence-along with the souls of the inconceivably vast multitudes who have been born and have died in the many myriad years since God breathed a living soul into the body of Adam. Not one of these is lost or forgotten-not one has passed from the sight of his Creator: and everyone is destined, at the end of the ages, to have restored to him the the body-mysteriously changed, rendered immortal as the spirit itself: and glorious also, unless doomed by its rebel spirit to selfchosen woe.

Yet, for many of us, the sure pos-

session of this truth that death is the gate of life appears to make curiously little difference to our attitude to it. Our sorrow is too much like the sorrow of those who have "no certain hope"-our forgetfulness is almost as rapid, as though we, too, held that remembrance was merely a morbid waste of time. We have no vivid sense of the "Communion of Saints" which binds the little flock of Christ's militant Church on earth with the great host of the victors in Paradise, and the multitude of others who wait and suffer the cleansing fires of purgatory, holding out their hands to ask our pity, our prayers and sacrifices for their happy deliverance from Love's prison house. The world is too much with us, with its vain shadows and images: that real world of the spirit is "out of sight and out of mind," save for a few brief moments in our busy lives of work and pleasure. The "vision splendid" of immortality, which uplifted and transfigured the first Christians, and whose glow was reflected in the world of the ages of faith, has grown sadly intermittent in our grey, secularized lives: and with its fading, the links of prayer between the two worlds grow more tenuous. - THE ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia, Nov. 3, 1949.

Anni Sacri

POPE PIUS XII

Translation of the encyclical inviting Catholics of the world to join in public prayers on Passion Sunday, March 26.

THE Holy Year, which is in the course of passing, has already furnished us more than one reason for joy and consolation. To Rome, whence the light of the Gospel teaching radiates since the origins of the Church, multitudes of the faithful have streamed from all parts of the world. They have come to the See of Peter not only to expiate their own faults, but also the sins of the world, and to implore the return of society to God, from Whom alone can come true peace of heart, civil concord and the well-being of nations.

And we know these first groups of pilgrims form the vanguard of those who will come more frequently and in greater numbers during the favorable season. Therefore, the hope is warranted that from this, still more salutary and abundant fruits will be harvested. Nevertheless, if these sights have given us gentle comfort, reasons are not lacking for the anxiety and anguish which grieve our paternal heart. And first of all, although war has almost everywhere ceased, nevertheless the longed-for peace has not come—a stable and solid peace which might happily solve the many and ever-increasing reasons for discord. Many nations are still opposed to each other; and as confidence lessens, an armaments race begins, leaving the hearts of all overcome by fear and trepidation.

ROOT OF ALL EVIL

That which seems to us not only the greatest evil but the root of all evil is this: often the lie is substituted for the truth and is then used as an instrument of dispute. On the part of not a few religion is passed by as a thing of no importance, and elsewhere absolutely prohibited in family and social life as a remnant of ancient superstitions. Public and private atheism is exalted in such a way that God and His law are being abolished and morals no longer have any foundation. The press also too often vulgarly reviles religious feeling while it does not hesitate to spread the most shameful obscenities, agitating and with incalculable harm leading into vice tender childhood and betrayed youth.

By means of false promises people are deceived and provoked to hatred, rivalry and rebellion, especially when their inherited faith, the only hope in this earthly exile, is successfully torn from their hearts. Disturbances,

riots and revolts are organized and fomented in continuing series, which prepare the ruin of the economy and cause irreparable harm to the common

We must all deplore with overwhelming sadness that in not a few nations the rights of God, Church and human nature itself are outraged and trampled upon. Sacred ministers, even those invested with high dignities, are either driven from their proper sees, exiled and imprisoned, or so hindered that they cannot exercise their ministry. In the field of education, whether on the elementary or the university level, as well as in publications and the press, permission to explain and defend the doctrine of the Church either is not given or is so restricted and subjected to such surveillance by official censorship that it would seem to be established as an arbitrary principle that truth, liberty and religion must submissively serve only the civil authority.

Since these innumerable evils spring, as We have said, from one source only, the repudiation of God and contempt for His law, it is necessary, venerable brethren, to offer to God fervent prayers and recall all to those principles whence alone can come enlightenment for minds, peace and concord for souls and well-ordered justice between the various social classes.

TEACHINGS OF THE GOSPEL

As you know, once religion is taken away, there cannot be a well-ordered, well-regulated society. Hence the urgency to spur on priests under your guidance in order that, especially during the Holy Year, they spare no efforts that souls entrusted to them, with their false prejudices and erroneous convictions cast aside, and hatreds and discords settled, may nourish themselves on the teachings of the Gospel and thus participate in Christian life so as to hasten the desired renewal of morals.

And since the priest can reach neither everybody nor everything, and as his work is not always able to meet adequately all needs, those who serve in the ranks of Catholic Action must offer the aid of their own experience and activity. No one must be idle and lazy in the face of so many evils and dangers and while those in the other camp strive to destroy the very basis of Catholic religion and Christian worship. Let it never come to pass that "the children of this world are wiser in their generation that the children of light" (Luke 16, 8); let it never be that the latter are less active than the former.

But human efforts are ineffective unless supported by Divine grace. We exhort you therefore, venerable brethren, to begin a veritable crusade of prayer among your faithful to implore from the Father of Mercies and the God of Consolation (2 Cor. 1, 3) suitable remedies for the present evils. We intensely desire that, united with us, they offer public prayers on March 26, Passion Sunday, when the sacred rites of the Church begin to commemorate the bitter sufferings by means of which the Divine Redeemer liberated us from slavery to the demon and led us back to the freedom of the sons of God. It is our intention on that day to descend into the Basilica of St. Peter to unite our prayers not only with those present but—as we hope

—with those of the whole Catholic world. Let those who, because of illness or old age or other reasons, cannot come to church offer to God with humble and trusting heart their sufferings and their fears so that the prayer of all,

the yearning of all and the wish of all may be one.

Let all, united with us in prayer, implore from the Divine mercy that a new order, based on truth, justice and charity, may arise from the longed-for renovation of morals. May the Heavenly Light illuminate the minds of those who have in their hands the destinies of peoples; may they realize that just as peace is the work of wisdom and justice, so war is the fruit of blindness and hatred. Let them consider that one day they must render account not only to history but to God's eternal judgment.

Those who profusely sow the seed of hatred, of discord and of rivalry; those who secretly or openly arouse the masses and provoke rebellions; those who deceive with empty promises the easily agitated crowd, even they must understand that the justice demanded by Christian principles, which gives birth to equilibrum and fraternal concord, is achieved not

through force and violence but by the application of the law.

Guided by the supreme light gained by collective prayer, let all be persuaded that only the Divine Redeemer can compose the many and formidable conflicts; only Jesus Christ, We say, Who is the Way, the Truth and the Life (John 14, 6), Who gives celestial clarity to clouded minds and Divine strength to doubtful and indolent wills (Imitation of Christ III, Ch. 34, 55) alone can rule earthly events with justice and compose them in love; He alone can set on the road to eternal happiness the souls of men joined by the bond of brotherhood.

With faith, love and hope, therefore, We address to Him our prayers. May He then, especially during this Holy Year, benignly look down upon humanity, oppressed by so many misfortunes, assailed by so many fears and by waves of so many discords. And as one day, by His Divine sign, He calmed the tempest on the Lake of Galilee, so today may He quiet human

storms.

Let the lies of the wicked be exposed by His light, let the surly arrogance of the proud be humbled, let the rich be led to justice, generosity and charity, let the poor and wretched take as their model the family of Nazareth, which also earned its bread through daily labor; finally, let those who hold the government of state be persuaded that there is no more solid social foundation than Christian teaching and the safeguarding of religious liberty.

We desire, venerable brethren, that you make these things known to the faithful entrusted to your care and that you exhort them to pray fre-

vently with us to the Lord.

Confident that all will respond to our exhortations with loving willingness, with fullness of heart We impart to each one of you and all your faithful our Apostolic Benediction, pledge of our benevolence and token of heavenly favor.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's March 12, 1950, twelfth year of our Pontificate.

On Humanism

POPE PIUS XII

An address by his Holiness to members of the International Convention of Humanistic Studies, September 25, 1949.

GENTLEMEN, it is with great pleasure that We reply with a cordial welcome to your kind respects. In this greeting there is more than a simple indication of general pleasure and gratitude for your action.

In fact your sessions have aroused in us a deep interest. If it is true, as has been correctly said, that ideas, good or bad, guide the world, then one must realize the great importance of an exchange of views between philosophers who aim at projecting a ray of light on so many present-day questions—questions on which many of the most incompetent persons speak with such certainty and decision. This latter would not matter except that it disturbs the minds and sows confusion, particularly among the fine intellectual youth, who tomorrow will be called to guide the coming generation.

"Humanism and Political Science"—this is the subject of your discussions. Humanism is now the order of the day. Without doubt, there is great difficulty in forming and recognizing, through its historic evolution, a clear concept of its nature. Nevertheless, although humanism claimed for a long time to be formally opposed to the Middle Ages which preceded it, it is certain that all it contains of the true, the good, the great and the eternal belongs to the spiritual world of the greatest genius of the Middle

Ages, St. Thomas Aguinas.

In general outline, the concept of man and of the world held by Christian and Catholic perspective remains essentially the same. Thus it is the same in St. Augustine, St. Thomas and in Dante, as it remains the same even in modern Christian philosophy. The obscurity of certain philosophical and theological questions, which have been clarified and gradually solved through the course of the ages, does not detract anything from the reality

of this fact.

May

11.

d-

ls

ze

of

er

ot

Without taking into account the fleeting opinions which have appeared at various periods, the Church has affirmed the value of what is human and what is in conformity with nature. Without any hesitation she has sought to develop it and place it in evidence. She does not admit that in the sight of God man is mere corruption and sin. On the contrary, in the eyes of the Church Original Sin did not intimately affect man's aptitudes and strength, and has left essentially intact the natural light of his intelligence and his freedom. Man endowed with this nature is undoubtedly injured and weakened by the heavy inheritance of a fallen nature, deprived of supernatural and preternatural gifts. He must make an effort to observe the natural law—this with the powerful assistance of the Grace of Christ—so that he can live as the honor of God and his dignity as man require.

The natural law—here is the foundation on which the social doctrine of the Church rests. It is precisely her Christian conception of the world which has inspired and sustained the Church in building up this doctrine on such a foundation. When she struggles to win and defend her own freedom, she is actually doing this for the true freedom and for the fundamental rights of man. In her eyes these essential rights are so inviolable that no argument of State and no pretext of common good can prevail against them.

They are protected by an insurmountable wall. As far as this wall the common good can legislate as it pleases, but beyond this wall it may not go. It cannot touch these rights, for they constitute what is most precious

in the common good.

If this principle would be respected, how many tragic catastrophes and what threatening dangers would be averted. This principle alone could renew the social and political face of the world. Who, however, is to have this unconditional respect for the rights of man, except a person who knows that he is acting under the gaze of a personal God?

Sound human nature, accepting what the Christian faith offers, can do much. It can save man from the grip of technocracy and materialism.

We have desired, gentlemen, to suggest these thoughts for your consideration. We hope that they may guide your studies and your teaching of

philosophy in a similar direction.

No! the destiny of man is not in "Geworfensein," in abandonment. Man is God's creature and he lives constantly under the guidance and the vigilance of His Paternal Providence. Let us work, then, to rekindle in the new generation, confidence in God, in itself and in the future and thus render possible the dawning of a more tolerable and happier order.

May Almighty God, the beginning and end of all things, the Alpha and

Omega, bless and enrich your work,

American Aid to Germany

THE GERMAN HIERARCHY

Letter to the Hierarchy of the United States, November 14, 1949.

WE, THE German Bishops, in full assembly at the hallowed shrine and tomb of Saint Boniface—himself of Anglo-Saxon origin—remember anew and with deep gratitude the beneficence which the Most Reverend Bishops and Catholic faithful of the United States of America have in the

course of the past year conferred upon us in Christian charity.

Those gifts have replenished our empty hands, thus enabling us to procure partially effective recuperation or even, in some cases, complete recovery for our ailing children. Those gifts have, in many instances, kept our aged and destitute alive; without the American Catholic assistance starvation would have been inevitable. We have also been able in some measure to assist the millions of refugees from the East, and our returning prisoners of war, thanks to your spontaneous response to the pleas of need

ne

wn

da-

ble

ail

he

ot

us

nd

ıld

ve

ho

do

d-

of

an

zi-

he

us

nd

that have arisen from a desolate Germany in these postwar years. Hearts without number are filled with deepest gratitude to the American Catholics who have since the end of the war so open-heartedly, and often at considerable personal sacrifice, collected almost 30 million pounds of relief supplies for the German people.

Though a remarkable change has been wrought in the living conditions of Germans, it has not been so decisive as to permit us to inform our helpers abroad that we are now able to manage without outside assistance. If we, the German Bishops, deeply concerned with the fate of those entrusted to our care, are once more turning for help to other countries, it is chiefly for the sake of our refugees from the East. Their destitution cries for extensive assistance, to a point far beyond our own powers.

The general situation, it is true, has improved considerably and especially in Western Germany. This is due primarily to the generous economic help from the United States. Concerning the urgent problem of the refugees from the East, however, no satisfactory solution has as yet been found. Where we are concerned, it is a matter of simple fact that we have never been able to give more than a kind of "first-aid" for the most elementary needs of those most unhappy people, despite the magnitude of the material relief we have received from abroad. If ever Germany is to have peaceful social conditions, it is imperative that a way be found to assimilate the millions of refugees from the East. This will be possible only by adopting wide-reaching measures, such as a well-planned resettlement program inside German borders, by creation of new manufacturing centers and housing projects, as well as by finding possibilities for the emigration of some of the refugees.

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

We German Bishops shall do our utmost towards awakening and encouraging a sense of responsibility and a spirit of sacrifice in our people, as well as fostering their will to help themselves. Our efforts alone, however, will not be sufficient to effect a solution to the refugee problem, which in turn is of paramount importance in the general reconstruction of Germany and Europe. Stated as simply as possible: we still need much help from abroad.

We therefore entreat our Most Reverend Brethren, the Bishops of the United States, to intercede in joint cooperation with us before those powers on whom the fate of Germany depends so that the refugee question may be recognized as a problem of international importance and responsibility.

We further ask that an extensive and special relief action be initiated on behalf of the German refugees from the East. Considering the causes, the extent, and the special circumstances of this great burden, we feel it our duty to beg for some special assistance from other countries.

As the ecclesiastical Charity Organizations in Germany will be confronted by a great number of new problems with regard to the refugees, we shall be deeply appreciative if our esteemed brethren, the Bishops of the United States of America, will continue to help us with donations by means of War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference,

especially for the purpose of assisting the needy and unfortunate refugees. We ask for the continuation of this help until we shall be able to cope with the problem unassisted. We request such assistance especially for those parts of Western Germany where religious Catholic life is in danger, as well as for Eastern Germany.

The American deeds of Christian charity during the past four years will remain embedded in the hearts and minds of all Germans. We are most thankful for what has already been, and is being done. Should it be possible by means of some special relief action to solve definitively this terrible plight of the millions of persons expelled from the East, this of itself would forever manifest its beneficent results in the common cause of rescuing and saving Christian culture.

American Freedom and Catholic Power

"Mr. Blanshard's book does display vulgar anti-Catholicism on almost every page. What but vulgar anti-Catholicism is it to ridicule the names of Catholic religious institutions, to sneer at 'the whole segregated system of nuns, wimples and convents' as 'medieval posturing and useless mortifications,' or to interpret Catholic objections to intermarriage with Jews as anti-Semitism? How, I wonder, would your correspondent have felt had Mr. Blanshard cast such gibes at the 'medieval' yeshivot right in our own up-to-date New York City, at Jews praying ('posturing') in tallit and tefillim, at the 'useless' prescriptions of kashrut, or a Jewish objections to intermarriage with Catholics? To me bigotry is bigotry whether directed against Catholics or Jews."—Will Herberg in Commentary, March, 1950.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

RDFTOR: Robert C. Hartnett EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the AMERICA staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

Business Manager: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.